

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Silver Spring, Maryland
Tuesday, November 6, 2018

1 PARTICIPANTS:

2 ERIKA FELLER, Chair
3 Director, Marine and Coastal Conservation
National Fish & Wildlife Foundation

4 JENNIFER ANDERS
5 Northwest Power and Conservation Council
6 Montana, Salish-Kootenai Tribes and Kootenai
Tribe of Idaho

7 SEBASTIAN BELLE
8 Executive Director
Maine Aquaculture Association

9 ROGER BERKOWITZ
10 President and Chief Executive Officer
Legal Sea Foods, LLC

11 KATHERINE CHENEY
12 Public Affairs Specialist
West Coast Region

13 RICH CODY
14 ECS Federal LLC; MRIP Program Management Team
Member
Office of Science and Technology

15 CLIFF COSGROVE
16 Manager
S-K Grant Program

17 MEGAN DAVIS, Ph.D.
18 Research Professor, Aquaculture, Florida
Atlantic University
Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institute

19 KELLY DENIT
20 Division Chief, Domestic Fisheries
Office of Sustainable Fisheries

21 DAVID DONALDSON
22 Executive Director
Gulf States

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2 RUSS DUNN
3 National Policy Advisor on Recreational
4 Fisheries
5 Office of Sustainable Fisheries

6 RAIMUNDO ESPINOZA
7 Environmental Consultant

8 RANDY FISHER
9 Executive Director
10 Pacific States

11 DAVID HALL
12 Public Affairs Officer, NOAA
13 Office of Marine and Aviation Operations

14 HEATH HEIKKILA
15 Coastal Conservation Association
16 Pacific Norwest Fisheries

17 ROBERT E. JONES
18 Gulf of Mexico Regional Director
19 Environmental Defense Fund

20 DONNA KALEZ
21 Owner and Manager
22 Dana Wharf Sportfishing & Whale Watching

23 HEIDI LOVETT
24 Senior Policy Analyst

25 JENNIFER LUKENS
26 Director, Office of Policy

27 SARA McDONALD, Ph.D.
28 Senior Fisheries Scientist
29 Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch

30 PETER MOORE
31 Fisheries and Community Development Consultant

32

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2 STEFANIE MORELAND
3 Director of Government Relations & Seafood
4 Sustainability
5 Trident Seafood

6 DAN NAMUR
7 Director, External Funding Division
8 Office of Management and Budget

9 MIKE OKONIEWSKI
10 Pacific Seafood Group

11 CHRIS OLIVER
12 Assistant Administrator for Fisheries

13 JIM PARSONS
14 General Manager
15 Cooke Aquaculture Pacific

16 KELLIE RALSTON
17 Southeast Fisheries Policy Director
18 American Sportfishing Association

19 SAM RAUCH
20 Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory
21 Programs

22 ERVIN "JOE" SCHUMACKER
Marine Scientist, Quinault Department of
Fisheries
Quinault Indian Nation

BARRY THOM
Regional Administrator for the West Coast

MATTHEW UPTON
Attorney
United States Seafood

DAVID VAN VORHEES
Division Chief, Fisheries Statistics Division
Office of Science and Technology

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2 FRANCISCO (CISCO) WERNER, Ph.D.
3 Director
4 Scientific Programs and Chief Science Advisor

5 RICHARD YAMADA
6 Owner
7 Shelter Lodge

8

9 * * * * *

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

C O N T E N T S

ITEM:	PAGE
Welcome, Introductions & Agenda Review7
Report from the Assistant Administrator	24
Fishing Effort Survey	32
Electronic Recreational Fisheries Reporting79
Saltonstall-Kennedy Grant-Making Process and Review	119
Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force	176

* * * * *

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (8:38 a.m.)

3 CHAIR FELLER: Good morning. If I could
4 get you all's attention. I think we're going to
5 go ahead and get started now that I've made fun of
6 Jennifer and that kind of crosses one thing off my
7 to do list. Welcome everyone. It's a pleasure to
8 be here with you again and really exciting to be
9 here as chair so I look forward to however long
10 this lasts. Jen's going to go through the agenda
11 in a second, but we have three new members of
12 MAFAC who are here for their first meeting this
13 time and I kind of thought maybe it would be a
14 good thing for us to go around at first and just
15 introduce ourselves so everybody knows who
16 everybody else is and if you're a new member, I
17 can't quite see you so identify yourself when you
18 do and that and, I don't know, maybe I'll start.
19 I'm Erica Feller. I work for the National Fish
20 and Wildlife Foundation as the Director of Marine
21 and Coastal Conservation. I just started my
22 second term on MAFAC and I also work -- I'm the

1 Chair of the Policy Management and Budget
2 Subcommittee in addition to this job. Just of
3 note, you have to push the little talk button on
4 your microphone to speak and then turn it off when
5 you're done please.

6 MR. MOORE: Easier than finding my way
7 here. Sorry I'm late. Peter Moore. I'm a
8 returning member, I guess. First term still, I
9 think. I live in Vermont which is, like, there's
10 no ocean. There used to be an ocean, Lake
11 Champlain used to be a big ocean. I moved over
12 there from Maine where I was living and working in
13 the industry since 1995 in Portland and New
14 Bedford. We had a plant in both places. Prior to
15 that, I was in Alaska for a long time in fishing
16 and also worked at Alaska Fisheries Development
17 foundation so I'm clearly bullished person
18 fishing, but I also feel I'm sort of a climate
19 refugee. Our plant in New Bedford was Herring and
20 Mackerel. We closed it in 2011. There were four
21 boats involved. Two went back to Alaska and
22 continue to make a lot of money in pollock. The

1 Herring and Mackerel Fishery has been an
2 interesting one for our coast. Anybody that's in
3 the lobster industry is very worried right now
4 about what's happening with herring or what's not
5 happening with herring. It's not recruiting well.
6 Mackerel has probably moved to Canada forever
7 maybe. It's the Gulf of Maine certainly, but it's
8 definitely moving and so I got into ocean
9 observing through the fishing industry and in the
10 IOOS program after 2012 until about last year at
11 this time. I was the Director of Stakeholder
12 Engagement, which is a fancy name for saying that
13 I would pull the fishing industry into the science
14 and we had a lot of successes on that front with I
15 guess it's called collaborative research, but it
16 was more fine scale than that. We were basically
17 the brains of really good fisherman to help round
18 out some of the ocean predictive in the East Coast
19 and since then, I've been starting up a new
20 project with the SK Funds to do more of that,
21 what's known as the cold pool in the Mid Atlantic,
22 which is something that really drives a lot of the

1 fish movements and, sort of, recruitments and so
2 on. Not a lot is known about it, but that's sort
3 of where I am now and I'm enjoying that very much.
4 Thank you.

5 MR. JONES: Hi. My name is Robert
6 Jones. My day job is the Director of the Gulf of
7 Mexico in the Environmental Defense Fund working
8 in the for hire, recreational, and commercial
9 components of the fishery. This is my second
10 MAFAC meeting so I'm pretty new. I grew up in
11 Corpus Christi, Texas, and lifelong recreational
12 angler and hunter and I'm excited to be here and
13 look forward to working with everybody.

14 MR. UPTON: Good morning. Matt Upton.
15 I work US Seafoods. We operate trawlers off
16 Alaska. I do a variety of things for them from
17 legal work to managing vessels and I'm pretty
18 involved in fisheries management up in the North
19 Pacific. I spend a lot of time with our captains
20 who are always telling me, "Just say no. Stop
21 giving the away and our access to different
22 fishing areas." So, it's nice to be here.

1 MS. RALSTON: Good morning. I'm Kellie
2 Ralston with the American Sport Fishing
3 Association. This is my first MAFAC meeting so
4 excited to be here. I'm actually based out of
5 Tallahassee, Florida and handle South East
6 fisheries issues for ASA, everything from
7 fisheries to water quality to access and looking
8 forward to this week's discussions. Thanks.

9 MR. PARSONS: I'm Jim Parsons and
10 General Manager for Cooke Aquaculture's Pacific
11 Operations located out of Seattle, Washington.
12 Also, President of the National Aquaculture
13 Association.

14 MR. DONALDSON: I'm Dave Donaldson, the
15 Executive Directs of the Gulf State's Marine
16 Fisheries Commission and we are the three
17 interstate commissions or advisors to MAFAC.

18 MR. FISHER: Hi. I'm Randy Fisher. I'm
19 the Executive Director of the Pacific States
20 Marine Fisheries Commission out of Portland and
21 this is my three thousand MAFAC meeting.
22 (Laughter)

1 MR. VAN VOORHEES: Hi. I'm Dave Van
2 Voorhees. I'm the Chief of the Fisheries
3 Statistics Division our Headquarters Office of
4 Science and Technology. We're responsible for
5 implementation of the Marine Recreational
6 Information Program that I'll be talking to you
7 about today.

8 MR. DUNN: I'm Russ Dunn with NOAA
9 Fisheries. I'm the National Policy Advisor for
10 Recreational Fisheries.

11 MR. SARTWELL: Tim Sartwell, Office of
12 Sustainable Fisheries. I work with Russ on
13 Recreational Fisheries issues.

14 MS. LOVETT: Hi. I'm Heidi Lovett. I
15 work in the Policy office and I help manage MAFAC.

16 MR. SCHUMACKER: Good morning. I'm Joe
17 Schumacker. I'm the Marine Resources Scientist
18 with the Quinault Indian Nation on the coast of
19 Washing State. It's one of four Coastal Treaty
20 Tribes out there that actually have rights in the
21 ocean. It's a unique set up out there. I've been
22 with them for about 19-1/2 years now.

1 MR. OKONIEWSKI: There we go. Mike
2 Okoniewski, basic fish monger and I've been doing
3 for 49 years now. Twenty some of years of that
4 have been Alaska and I've worked basically in
5 Canada at times. Also, down in Mexico a little
6 bit and done some sardine sales over in Japan for
7 a while. Not too many fisheries I haven't been
8 involved in. California, Oregon, and Washington
9 also. So, basically, I management plants for a
10 long time and then I started managing division and
11 started getting involved in policy stuff about
12 2000. A whole new world for me, but happy to be
13 here today even though it is pouring down rain and
14 I left San Diego for this. (Laughter) But glad to
15 be here today and welcome to all the new people so
16 thank you.

17 MR. ESPINOZA: Well, I left Puerto Rico
18 for this. So, I'm Rai Espinoza. I am the
19 Executive Director for a small non-profit called
20 (inaudible) based in San Juan, Puerto Rico, where
21 we work with commercial fisherman as well as
22 recreational fisherman mainly on sustainable

1 development and conservation. So, we really focus
2 on how conservation can be a means for sustainable
3 development. So, as, like, conservation as a
4 means of economic growth. And so, to date, we've
5 had many projects that have really kind of changed
6 the face of how fisherman are seen in conservation
7 in Puerto Rico. Mainly, a project that we funded
8 through \$600, local fisherman have discovered new
9 populations of Nassau grouper, which is a species
10 that's of course. (Inaudible) versus a project
11 that was \$80,000 a lot of which was invested and
12 only found Nassau grouper. So, we're really
13 seeing how partnering with fisherman is really
14 beneficial to conservation as well as to local
15 communities and their economies. It's really out
16 of how to collaborate with local partners and how,
17 as fisherman tell me all the time, you guys may
18 have the academics, you have the PhD's in the
19 classroom, but our PhD's are out in the water so
20 that's a really partnership that we've developed
21 there and we are growing throughout the Caribbean
22 and Latin America.

1 MS. DAVIS: Good morning. I'm Megan
2 Davis. I'm with Florida Atlantic University
3 Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institute. My
4 background is in Marine Aquaculture. I have
5 mostly devoted most of career to the Queen Conch,
6 but I do work with other species, warm water
7 species, of aquaculture both for food and also for
8 restoration purposes. This is my second MAFAC
9 meeting and I'm really excited to be here today.

10 MR. YAMADA: Good morning everyone. My
11 name's Richard Yamada. I'm a sport fishing lodge
12 owner in Southeast Alaska. I have been doing that
13 for 37 years. I'm also the president of the
14 Alaska Charter Association, about 200 sportfishing
15 vessels in Alaska and just a recent appointee to
16 the International Pacific Halibut Commission. I'm
17 one of three US commissioners with Chris Oliver.
18 This is my second meeting and looking forward to
19 working with the committee. Thanks.

20 MR. BERKOWITZ: Good morning. Roger
21 Berkowitz. I own and operate Legal Seafoods,
22 which is a restaurant company, but we also do

1 wholesale and retail in fisheries as well.

2 MS. MORELAND: Good morning. My name is
3 Stefanie Moreland and I work with Trident
4 Seafoods. Trident takes delivery from more than
5 1,000 independent fisherman in the Alaska region.
6 We have shoreside operations in ten communities in
7 Alaska and also participate directly in harvesting
8 and have catcher processors in the Pacific
9 Northwest and the Alaska region. We do value
10 added processing in three regions globally and we
11 ship to over 50 countries and so have good
12 visibility on supply chains for seafood.

13 In addition, I sit on several trade
14 associations in the region and represent the
15 industry more broadly, harvesting interest more
16 broadly, and international standing organizations
17 such as the MSC Governance Process.

18 MS. KALEZ: Hi. I got it. My name is
19 Donna Kalez and I'm from Dana Wharf Sportfishing
20 and Whale Watching in Dana Point. This is my
21 first meeting so I'm happy to be here. I'm also
22 on the board of CCA California, which is the

1 Coastal Conservation Association of California and
2 I'm also on the board of the Sportfishing
3 Association of California and again, Dana Wharf
4 Sportfishing and Whale Watching has been around
5 since 1971 in Dana Point, California so I'm happy
6 to be here and I got to turn it off. There we go.

7 MS. MCDONALD: Good morning. I'm Sara
8 McDonald. I am a Senior Fishery Scientist with
9 the Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch Program
10 and this is also my first meeting. I'm really
11 excited to be here. In my former life, I was a
12 Manatee Biologist. My background is in protective
13 resources specifically in bycatch of protective
14 resources and I am the new terror of the
15 protective resources committee so I'm excited to
16 be here and thank for inviting me.

17 DR. WERNER: Good morning. I'm Cisco
18 Werner. This is my second year as a Chief
19 Scientist for NOAA fisheries and just to the point
20 of curiosity on the cold pool that you mentioned,
21 we had a chance to visit with Chinese colleagues
22 this summer and they also have a cold pool very

1 similar to the one in the Mid Atlantic, but what
2 they're going to do is they're going to build
3 these big cages and lower them into this cold pool
4 and grow salmon year around, you know, so even if
5 the upper part of the water column gets too warm,
6 they think that they can still do that down there
7 so go figure how they this about these things.
8 But, anyway, I'll be curious to see if that works.

9 MR. OLIVER: Good morning. Chris
10 Oliver. I'm the head of the National Marine
11 Service and as Richie pointed out, the newest
12 appointee to the International Pacific Halibut
13 Commission.

14 MS. LUKENS: Good morning everybody.
15 I'm Jennifer Lukens. I'm the Office Director of
16 the Office of Policy at NOAA Fisheries. I'm also
17 the Executive Director of MAFAC. That's my title,
18 but as Heidi pointed out down there, she's the one
19 who keeps it running and gets you all here and we
20 were thrown a bit of a curve ball yesterday with
21 the jack hammering at the Sheraton so appreciate
22 you all making your way over here in the rain.

1 There are a few things we sacrificed. One was
2 coffee. I sent out yesterday. But the other was
3 Wi-Fi. We do not have Wi-Fi for non-NOAA
4 employees her so apologies ahead of time for that.
5 I am serving as Erika's Vice Chair today, just
6 kidding, but I am looking for if people who are
7 interested in becoming the Vice Chair now that
8 Erika has taken the Chair seat.

9 So, with that, I'm just going to run
10 through the agenda topics for today and then turn
11 it over to Chris. Oh. Hi, Sebastian, you want to
12 introduce yourself?

13 MR. BELLE: Hi. Sebastian Belle with
14 the Main Aquaculture Association. Apologies for
15 being late. My plane was late coming into to D.C.

16 MS. LUKENS: Thanks Sebastian. Okay.
17 First, we're going to hear from Chris this
18 morning, just his usual report out. Thank you for
19 coming Chris. He's not feeling so hot today, so
20 he made it a priority to get here so appreciate
21 you being here. If you all made the effort to
22 come across the country, he made it here to chat

1 with you all today. Then we're going to move into
2 our first presentation of Kelly Denit and David
3 Van Voorhees. He's on our fishing effort survey
4 and an update on the service transition. We'll
5 take a short break and speaking of breaks, there
6 are restrooms located in the hallways out there.
7 The hallway closest to this room is for the
8 gentlemen. The hallway furthest away is for the
9 ladies.

10 And then we will reconvene, and we will
11 be getting a presentation from Rich Cody on the
12 electronic recreational fishing reporting and
13 overview the MREP program. Then we will have Dan
14 Namur and Chris Cosgrove from our Saltonstall
15 Kennedy Grant program. Dan spoke with us last
16 Fall about SK. By giving some of the topics that
17 we are going to be diving deeper into tomorrow and
18 the intense interest in questions we always get on
19 that, we thought we'd bring him back and give a
20 little bit more information on that and about the
21 opportunities for SK and understanding the process
22 for that.

1 We are going to break for lunch and then
2 this afternoon will be dedicated to touching base
3 with Columbia Basin Partnership Taskforce folks
4 who at our last meeting in the Spring in Portland
5 really focused large part with presentations from
6 that taskforce. They are going to give you an
7 update on where they are on the development of
8 their qualitative and quantitative goals and kind
9 of the next steps for that group in that process.
10 So, as MAFAC being the overseeing body of that
11 taskforce, it's really important that you all are
12 engaged and understand what they're going through
13 because ultimately those recommendations do come
14 out of you all.

15 And then we will break after that and we
16 have time for subcommittee meetings this
17 afternoon. We only have two subcommittee meetings
18 scheduled and I really encourage folks who aren't
19 assigned to a subcommittee that you're welcome to
20 join that discussion and see if you might want to
21 become a member of that. We will be talking about
22 the work of those subcommittees in the large

1 MAFAC, so I encourage you all to be engaged on
2 those issues.

3 We'll adjourn a little early today and
4 make our way over to -- we are in building 3 as we
5 call it here at the NOAA campus. We will next
6 door to building 2 and we will get a bit of a
7 presentation and get to see the NOAA Gateway
8 exhibit on the history of NOAA and their Heritage
9 Legacy program.

10 And then we will be making our way on
11 the Metro, which is just a few steps away from
12 there hoping it's not raining this afternoon to
13 head down to a short Metro ride to Legal Seafood
14 at Union Station for a happy hour there. So,
15 that's the overlay for the day. If you need
16 anything throughout the meeting, we've got Heidi
17 here and Jeanette up at the front of the room,
18 Jeanette, you want to wave, who can help you out
19 and assist you with anything. So, I think I've
20 covered all of my logistical things for the day.
21 Oh, one last thing. We have a court reporter
22 sitting next to Jeanette there. So, as you know,

1 these are public meetings. We are being broadcast
2 via teleconference webinar and we want to make
3 sure that we have an accurate reporting of the
4 conversation that we have so when you are speaking
5 up if you can just say your name before you give a
6 comment so that the court reporter can record that
7 properly. Yes, Erika?

8 CHAIR FELLER: Hey, I just wanted to say
9 one quick thing. The staff has put together a
10 great agenda for us and Sebastian and Roger and
11 Richard, all the subcommittee that are going to
12 present, have done a lot of work on it a well. My
13 job here is to keep us on track and on time and
14 move through everything on the agenda so I'm going
15 to try really hard to be in the moment and do
16 that. You guys can help me. There's at least
17 three of don't know and I look forward to getting
18 to know you. If you could me a favor, much like
19 we did in Portland, is if you want to speak, I'm
20 going to track. Just use your temp card and that
21 way I can kind of keep an eye on it and you guys
22 can spend more time focusing on the conversation

1 while I keep track of who wants to go next. But
2 thanks so much and Chris over to you.

3 MR. OLIVER: Good morning again
4 everybody. And I'm glad I was able to be here
5 this morning at least for a little while this
6 morning with you and welcome. Particularly
7 welcome to Kelly and Donna and Sara, new members,
8 and I understand, Donna, you may know my good
9 friend, Don Hanson. (Laughter) You've met him.
10 We had a really strong, highly qualified pool of
11 candidates so you should be proud of your
12 selection. We look forward to working with all of
13 you. We did lose three, well didn't lose, three
14 of your colleagues resigned during the year, Terry
15 Beideman and Rip Cunningham and Rasela Feliciano,
16 and we'll miss them and we recognize it's the
17 importance of the work that this committee does so
18 we want to have as full of a committee of 21
19 members as we can so we'll be announcing a new
20 nomination cycle right Jen?

21 MS. LUKENS: Correct.

22 MR. OLIVER: In the very near future and

1 will hope that you will help us share announcement
2 throughout your networks. We've had several new
3 centered directors and our regional directors,
4 five I believe, over the last several months with
5 NOAA Fisheries (National Marine Fisheries Service)
6 the most recent being the appointment selection of
7 Bob Foy, Dr. Robert Foy, as the head of the Alaska
8 Fisheries Science Center. Bob will be stationed in
9 Juneau and I'm especially pleased with that one.
10 I've known and worked with Bob for many, many
11 years in the North Pacific. He's been the Kodiak
12 Research Lab Director for the past 11 years, I
13 believe, and he's every well-known and respected
14 in the North Pacific. He's co-authored more than
15 60 scientific papers and he brings a real depth of
16 experience to that job so we're really happy about
17 that.

18 I just want to talk a little bit about
19 priorities as they relate to some of your agenda
20 items. I know that and I'm pleased that MAFAC's
21 work continues to focus on topics that intersect
22 and are important and supportive of NOAA as well

1 as NOAA Fisheries' priorities and it's a really
2 good agenda that's been put together and I know
3 that at least three or four of the agenda items
4 directly relate to some of those key priorities
5 that we've identified and all of them indirectly
6 of course.

7 At the last meeting, I spoke about our
8 forthcoming seafood and aquaculture and
9 recreational fisheries work and that work that
10 you're through your subcommittees and MAFAC itself
11 directly address the NOAA priority to the blue
12 economy priority that the admiral spoke to us
13 about and increase a sustainable economic
14 contributions of our fisheries and ocean resources
15 well as one of our three key NOAA Fisheries
16 strategic goals, which is outlined in our Annual
17 Priorities and Guidance Document and that is to
18 maximize our fishing opportunities while ensuring
19 the sustainability of our fisheries and fishing
20 communities. And one of the key aspects of that
21 is to expand our national seafood production and
22 competitiveness and I know that's a focus of first

1 of all, the presentation that Jennifer is going to
2 give tomorrow on the Fish and Seafood Promotion
3 Act, as well as the panel presentation with
4 invited speakers and I'm very much looking forward
5 to that panel discussion on how we elevate
6 consumer confidence in US seafood and seafood
7 promotion. And I'm not going to be able to be
8 here for all of your meeting. I'll be in and out
9 throughout the next couple of days and attend as
10 much as I possibly can, but I specifically am
11 going to try to make time to attend that one. You
12 have some key questions framed out and am hopeful
13 that that information you learned, and discussions
14 help you move your work plan ahead on that. Ahead
15 of that discussion and as part of the overall
16 topic, Paul Doremus and David O'Brien on our
17 aquaculture initiative and, as you know, expanding
18 aquaculture is the other key ingredient to
19 improving our seafood production and US
20 competitiveness. We are trying to create a
21 climate of opportunity for our domestic marine
22 aquaculture to flourish not in place of our wild

1 harvest fisheries, of course, but as another
2 viable option for growing healthy seafood
3 sustainably for consumers and I think recognizing
4 that expanding that marine aquaculture can
5 increase and diversify seafood production that
6 expands and stabilizes our overall US seafood
7 supply.

8 And that's why we're working with
9 stakeholders. Some of you are here in the room to
10 address the permanent and research barriers that
11 exist to expanding our domestic aquaculture and
12 obviously increase our economic opportunities,
13 seafood supply, and food security.

14 I want to talk about recreational
15 fisheries another prior of this administration
16 maximizing recreational fishing opportunities.
17 Since MAFAC has been routinely updated on our
18 Marine Recreational Information Program, MRIP, and
19 how that supports your recreational fishery
20 subcommittee. There are two presentations related
21 to this. The first is going to be by Dave Van
22 Vorhees and Kelly Denit and that's going to

1 explain the transition from the telephone survey
2 to the mail fishing effort survey and they'll
3 discuss the results of that execution, the
4 implications for the time series of data, and the
5 outreach they've been doing on those calibration
6 efforts.

7 The second one is by Rich Cody, which is
8 going to focus more directly on the tasks that you
9 outlined in your work plan and identifying how to
10 overcome challenges related to recruiting and
11 retaining participation for the non-for-hire
12 anglers in terms of electronic catch reporting
13 programs and that's of keen interest to me
14 particularly and to better quantify the universe
15 of recreational fisherman in federal waters. Rich
16 will into some detail and provide examples of the
17 MRIP certified electronic reporting programs in
18 the different states and regions of the country
19 and other e- reporting programs that are being
20 implemented through the Fishery Management Council
21 system as well as the states.

22 Lastly, just briefly touch on the

1 Columbia Basin Partnership Taskforce, the third
2 major topic on your agenda and to update on the
3 progress of that taskforce, which also directly
4 relates to another NOAA Fisheries priority, which
5 is to recover and conserve protective species
6 while supporting responsible fishing and resource
7 development. This taskforce under MAFAC is
8 particularly unique and it's worked in terms of
9 its work in engaging stakeholders, tribes, and
10 states from across the basin in a positive way
11 sort of in contrast, I believe, to the past legal
12 battles that have surrounded this issue and so
13 will learn more on the progress they've made on
14 their reports and next steps as they plan and move
15 forward on phase 2 of that work, which you
16 approved in June, so I'm looking forward to and
17 will try to attend that discussion as well.

18 So, I was trying to focus on the three
19 major areas, but you have several other
20 interesting on the agenda including information
21 about the Saltonstall-Kennedy Program, an update
22 on new science and research technologies and an

1 overview of budget issues. So, again, I want to
2 welcome you and express our appreciation for your
3 time and work that you put into the process and
4 it's very important to us and I'm happy to -- like
5 I said, I'll be in and out over the next few
6 days as much as I possibly can and so I just
7 wanted to make those few comments and welcome you
8 here and if you have any questions, I think we
9 have a few minutes. I don't want to get you too
10 far behind your agenda.

11 MS. LUKENS: We're a little behind, but
12 we can take a couple questions I think if anybody
13 has one.

14 MR. ESPINOZA: I just had a question
15 about -- it's not really in the agenda so I'm
16 pretty sure we're not going to be able to address
17 it now, but just to put it out there to see if at the
18 end we can, is to see if there's any time to speak
19 about the recovery funds that were issued due to
20 Hurricane Irma, Maria, and Harvey.

21 MR. OLIVER: I'll defer that question to
22 your Chairman, Chairperson, Erika, but I'm certain

1 we'd be happy to get the right people in the room
2 to have that discussion.

3 MS. LUKENS: Okay. Anybody else?

4 Thank, Chris. I hope you feel better.

5 MR. OLIVER: Thank you and
6 congratulations on your chairmanship.

7 MS. LUKENS: Thank you. I think we'll
8 just go right into the program and first up is
9 Kelly Denit and David Van Vorhees who are going to
10 talk to us about the Fishing Effort Survey.

11 MS. DENIT: Good morning everyone. My
12 name is Kelly Denit. I'm the Chief of Domestic
13 Fisheries Division in our Office of Sustainable
14 Fisheries. You've already met Dave so we're going
15 to take you through the fishing effort survey
16 transition and I'm just going to jump right in
17 because I tell that you are all just on the edge
18 of your seat about this. So, we're going to start
19 with just a brief overview reminder of how we
20 actual calculate total recreational catch. So, we
21 remember that we use surveys in order to do this
22 and we have two different surveys that we use.

1 The first is to calculate effort and in the past,
2 that's been the Coastal Household Telephone
3 Survey, the CHTS, and that's what he had
4 transitioned to a mail-based survey starting here
5 in 2018 and that is what allows us to estimate the
6 number of angler trips.

7 In addition, we have the Access Point
8 Angler In-step Survey or the APAS. This is the
9 dock side survey usually state employees that
10 anglers will run into when they're coming back on
11 their trips and that is what allows us to estimate
12 the number of fish caught per angler trip. That
13 information together is what allows us to estimate
14 the total number of fish that are caught.

15 So, just as a quick overview, I want to
16 remind everyone that the change that we're talking
17 about are focused on private boat and shore-based
18 modes only. This is not related to charter
19 fishing.

20 MR. DUNN: And where geographically?

21 MS. DENIT: Yes. Thank you, Russ.

22 MR. DUNN: I thought you were moving.

1 MS. DENIT: So, did everybody. And
2 obviously, given the map, we're focused on the
3 Atlantic Coast and the Gulf specifically, so many
4 of you from the West Coast North Pacific have not
5 experienced this, but this will give you a good
6 overview. So, the Fishing Effort Survey, like I
7 mentioned, is replacing our Coast Household
8 Telephone Survey. Do I have to use this
9 microphone? Can you hear me if I'm not next to
10 it?

11 CHAIR FELLER: I think the recorder
12 needs you to use the microphone.

13 MS. DENIT: Okay. So, the mail survey
14 has replaced the telephone survey and the key
15 thing to notice here are the changes in how we're
16 accomplishing that. So not only is it mail-based,
17 but were using the postal service database in
18 angler registries from the respective state in
19 order to target that survey. As a result, as you
20 will see in the data that David is going to walk
21 us through, we're getting higher and more accurate
22 estimates of trips.

1 In the terms over the overview of the
2 APAS, the dockside sampling, I just want to
3 highlight that we've made some changes to how that
4 survey is conducted. Those changes were
5 implemented four or five years ago in response to
6 a NAS study and the bottom is that they resulted
7 in better time of day coverage and more
8 statistically solid data.

9 So, Fishing Effort Survey. You're
10 probably wondering why would be move to a
11 mail-based survey. So, there's a few key things.
12 Number one, raise your hand if you have a
13 landline. Thank you. Okay. So, the Coastal
14 Household Telephone Survey was a random digit
15 dialing so it focused on using landlines. As you
16 just saw, there are no very many people who have
17 landlines anymore. So that's one contributing
18 factor and Dave's talk more about that, but that's
19 our wireless effect that you'll see in the data
20 where we're not reaching folks because they don't
21 have landlines.

22 The other one is how many people that

1 big red button on your phone, you get a call when
2 you see a number you don't recognize, you probably
3 click or you just silent it, right? So that also
4 created an issue for our telephone survey because
5 people don't recognize the number, they don't
6 answer the phone. As a result, to moving to the
7 mail-based approach and therefore, reaching more
8 anglers than we were with the telephone survey.
9 In addition, the survey is actually getting into
10 the right hands so with the telephone survey was
11 the person who took the survey, and, in many
12 cases, that was not necessarily the angler in the
13 household. With a mail-based approach, the survey
14 actually gets to the angler in the house to be
15 able to answer those questions.

16 As a result, we're seeing about three
17 times higher response rate so we're going to top
18 Coastal Household Telephone Survey, CHTS. We were
19 down to about 8 percent in the last year response
20 rate and with the Fishing Effort Survey, the
21 mail-based, were up to around 38 percent response
22 rate so it's a really substantial improvement.

1 MS. LOVETT: We can hear you too.

2 MS. DENIT: Thanks, Heidi. I feel like
3 it's a little bit of karaoke. So, also, we've
4 improved the questionnaire and also, a virtue of
5 the fact that folks are getting it in the mail
6 they have more time to complete the survey so many
7 of you, if you're on a phone conversation, someone
8 asks you a question you kind of have that time in
9 your own head and feel like you need to answer
10 quickly because of that awkward pause on the
11 phone, now that you got the mail-based you can
12 take your time, you check your calendar, check
13 your phone, remind yourself what you did and
14 getting more complete answers.

15 Those new approaches have been
16 extensively tested and peer reviewed by the
17 National Academies. Both passed with flying
18 colors. I will not read you the quote because you
19 all can do that yourselves.

20 And then I do want to spend a little bit
21 of time talking about the transition plan.
22 Obviously, we could not implement such a huge

1 change to our survey methodology all in one fell
2 swoop. We needed to be very strategic and
3 thoughtful about how we did that. So, we created
4 a transition team, which Dave and co-chair and is
5 composed of representatives from (inaudible)
6 households, the states, and the Interstate
7 (inaudible) Atlantic States Commission in this
8 particular case and gulf states of course.

9 So, the three key things for you all to
10 be aware of are the (inaudible) tracking period.
11 So, from 2015 to 2017, we were able to conduct
12 both surveys at the same time. That allowed us to
13 create a calibration between the phone survey and
14 the mail-based survey. Creating that calibration
15 allowed us to then convert the historical
16 estimates into this new currency, the Fishing
17 Effort Survey currency. Now, that is what we
18 publicly announced this summer. That information
19 is now being fed into stock assessment, which I'll
20 talk more about a little bit later. And then we
21 can go into an inform management decisions.

22 And so, just really quick, as a

1 reminder, Annual Catch Limits is the question
2 we've gotten repeatedly from stakeholders. The
3 2018 catch limits for all our fisheries were set
4 using the CHTS. So, we have starting 2018 we only
5 have the Fishing Effort Survey information. So,
6 our calibration model allows us to convert that
7 effort information back into the CHTS currency so
8 at the end of the year when we're comparing Catch
9 to ACL's, we're doing it in the same currently.
10 So, we're not shifting the baseline on folks. If
11 ACL was set using CHTS, then that's how the catch
12 is going to be calculated as well. With that,
13 I'll hand it over to Dave.

14 MR. VAN VORHEES: Thank you, Kelly.
15 What I'm going to do is walk you through some
16 slides that show you the results of the
17 calibrations that we applied to revise the
18 historical estimates. They account for both the
19 change from the telephone survey to the mail
20 survey, but also accounts for changes we made in
21 the Access Point Angler Intercept Survey. This
22 first graph shows how the estimates of (inaudible)

1 fishing effort changed across the Atlantic and
2 Gulf Coast where we conduct the surveys. You can
3 see that the orange line along the bottom
4 represents the original estimates for the time
5 series. The blue line above that indicates the
6 estimates after we applied the calibrations. So,
7 you can see there is a significant change.

8 The peer reviewed calibration models
9 that we developed to account for the differences
10 were applied to produce these results. In
11 particular, the calibration model for the change
12 from telephone survey to the new mail survey
13 showed two significant factors that were driving
14 the difference. One we refer to as the telephone
15 versus mail factor. You can see that that factor
16 applies for the change throughout the whole time
17 series. What we mean by this is simply households
18 respond very differently to a mail survey then how
19 they respond to a random digital and telephone
20 survey. The calibration model is basically
21 telling us that. The information we have with
22 three years of side-by-side comparisons of the two

1 methods shows that that's a strong difference.
2 So, if we go back in time, if we had done both
3 surveys back in the 1980's, we would likely have
4 gotten very different results because of that
5 because the response you get from a mail survey
6 contact is just likely to be different than what
7 you would get in response to a telephone call.

8 Beyond the year 2000, you can see where
9 we have a dotted line on the graph, moving forward
10 from 2000 to 2017, we see another factor coming
11 into play that's driving the difference between
12 the original telephone survey estimates and the
13 new mail survey estimates if we had actually
14 conducted the mail survey back then. This is what
15 they call the wireless effect and Kelly referred
16 to this briefly. It's basically that the coverage
17 of the telephone survey has decreased over time
18 because more and more households that used to have
19 a landline phone and answered it, either don't
20 have a landline phone anymore or they don't answer
21 that landline phone. So, the switch to wireless
22 telephones has resulted in a significant decrease

1 in the coverage of the telephone survey. What
2 this means that the people that are actually
3 contacted by the telephone survey in the recent
4 three years when they run side-by-side, take a
5 lower number of fishing trips on average than the
6 people that we contacted in the past when
7 everybody was responding to a landline telephone
8 survey.

9 So, you can see for the years from 1981
10 to 2000 the changes, due to the calibrations, are
11 relatively constant in a proportional way. In
12 particular here, you can see that the change
13 throughout that timeframe for private boat is only
14 in the order of doubling of the fishing trips. As
15 you go from 2000 forward and we had the additional
16 effect of wireless telephones reducing coverage of
17 the phone survey, that difference increases to a
18 point of the end of the time series where it's
19 almost a tripling of the original estimate.

20 The next graph shows you the changes in
21 shore fishing effort as a result of the switch on
22 the application of the calibrations that take into

1 account the changes. Here again, it's the change
2 from the telephone survey to mail survey that's
3 having the most significant effect on the
4 calibration results. You can also see in this
5 case that we had the same factors coming into
6 play, but the change from the original estimates
7 to the new calibrated estimates is greater for
8 shore fishing effort than it was for private boat
9 fishing effort. So, you can see the years from
10 '81 to 2000 we basically have more than a tripling
11 of the original estimates as a result of applying
12 the calibration.

13 As you go forward from 2000 to 2017,
14 that proportional difference gradually increases
15 to where we reach a point at the end of the time
16 series where it's essentially increasing estimates
17 by five times.

18 I'm going to show you a few slides that
19 just show you how the catch estimates change as a
20 result of the changes in the effort estimates. As
21 Kelly showed you in that first slide, we have
22 effort estimates that are used to expand average

1 catch rates that we get from our on-site survey.
2 So, if you increase the effort estimate, you're
3 going to end up increasing the total catch
4 estimate because the effort is multiplied times
5 the average catch per trip from the on-site
6 survey. So, it's not surprising that we're seeing
7 similar changes in the catch estimates than what
8 we see in the effort estimates and it's largely
9 being drive by the changes in both private boat
10 fishing effort and shore fishing effort, which you
11 might expect that you're going to see greater
12 changes for catch estimates of species that have a
13 significant shore fishing component because where
14 we saw there was a bigger change. If the fishery
15 is largely a private boat fishery and not much of
16 a shore fishing fisher, you're not going to see as
17 big of change and that's what you'll see as a go
18 through these examples.

19 So, Bluefish I'm starting off with
20 because most of you know Bluefish can actually be
21 caught from shore as well as from private boats so
22 there is a pretty significant shore component to

1 fishing for Bluefish. Here you can there's a
2 pretty striking change in the estimates as result
3 of applying the calibrations. In the early years
4 from '81 to 2000, we basically have a change on
5 the order of two and half times. It's more than a
6 doubling of the original estimate. As you go from
7 2000 forward, where the wireless effect comes into
8 play, the proportional change in the estimates
9 actually increases over that time period to a
10 point at the end of the time series where it's
11 almost a quadrupling of the original estimate.

12 I want to point out here that this is
13 harvest on this slide, which is just the fish that
14 are actually removed from the fishery. It does
15 count fish that are caught and released alive at
16 sea.

17 This graph basically shows the total
18 catch so it's including what was actually removed
19 from the resources where all those that were
20 released alive after being caught. So, basically
21 more pattern to what we saw on the previous slide.
22 But this is actually important to look at because

1 really what goes into stock assessments is a
2 measure of the total mortality of recreational
3 fishing so it's just the fish that are land, but
4 also are fish that are caught and released at sea.
5 There is usually some sort of a mortality factor
6 applied to those and it varies among species as to
7 what that factor is.

8 Another species, Summer Flounder. You
9 can see what the changes are for Summer Flounder
10 for the Atlantic Coast. Here the changes aren't
11 as great as they were for Bluefish. That's
12 because the proportion of Summer Flounder that are
13 caught from shore is less than what we see for
14 Bluefish historically. But there's still a
15 significant change. In this case, the change is
16 in the early years leading in to 2000 it's about a
17 50 percent increase, which is about one and half
18 times the original estimate and as you go from
19 2004 to 2017, that proportional difference
20 increases to about two and a half times the
21 original estimate.

22 We see something similar from the total

1 catch when we include the catch released alive at
2 sea. Here again, the average change in the early
3 years from '81 to 2000 where it would it be
4 constant, but that proportional difference
5 increases as you go from 2000 to the present
6 mostly due to the wireless effect.

7 Black Sea Bass. What we're showing here
8 is the catch of Black Sea Bass for the entire
9 Atlantic Coast. This is not separating out the
10 north and south stocks of Black Sea Bass for the
11 Atlantic, but you can see here again, as we're to
12 a species that has less short catch, less than
13 Summer Flounder and Blue Fish, the changes aren't
14 as great because most of the change is driven by
15 the change in the private boat effort estimates.
16 In the early years '81 to 2000, it's a relatively
17 constant proportional change on the order of about
18 20 percent increase. It's pretty modest. But as
19 you go from 2000 forward to 2017, that increase is
20 to about 140 percent increase or more than a
21 doubling. I see a similar pattern for the total
22 catch if you include the catches released alive at

1 sea where the difference is they are increasing as
2 you go from 2000 forward primarily due to the
3 increase in effort due to the wireless effect.

4 And finally, I give you a Gulf species
5 of interest. Gulf Red Snapper. What we see here
6 is that the harvest, the fish actually removed,
7 landed, if you will, the proportional change in
8 those estimates as a result of applying the
9 calibrations is relative constant throughout the
10 time series. Here, again, this is primarily a
11 private boat fishery in the Gulf of Mexico. It
12 was essentially a little or no shore component.
13 So, the changes are largely due to the change in
14 the private boat effort estimates alone.

15 I do want to point out that the
16 calibration for the change in the intercept survey
17 that collects the catch data, in this case
18 actually kind of counteracted the changes due to
19 the switch from telephone to mail and that's what
20 causes this to be a relatively constant change
21 throughout the time series.

22 For the total catch, it's a little more

1 apparent, but in the more recent years the
2 proportional change as a result of the
3 calibrations becomes a little bit greater than it
4 was in the early from '81 to 2000.

5 And with that, I'm going to hand the
6 clicker back to Kelly.

7 MS. DENIT: Thank you, sir. So, I know
8 what you're all thinking. Where is the mushroom
9 cloud head exploding emoji because that's what I
10 want to push? So, I want to talk you through a
11 little bit what are the impacts, what are the next
12 steps, how is this going to work moving forward.
13 So, first is clearly we need to incorporate this
14 new data into stock assessments and as all of you
15 articulated as part of your intro, we can't do all
16 of our -- you know the council process, you know
17 our process. We can't do stock assessments for
18 every single species all at once. So, working
19 with the transition team, we prioritized our stock
20 assessments and are working through that last
21 right now so a couple big ones that will be coming
22 up here in the next months are for Fluke and

1 Striped Bass along the Atlantic Coast.

2 So, we will work through those stock
3 assessments over the next couple years to
4 incorporate this calibrated data. That will then
5 inform those three boxes we've got along the
6 bottom. The first is stock status. So, is the
7 stock actually overfished or is overfishing
8 occurring? Whether there needs to be any changes
9 to annual catch limits based on the calibrated
10 data. And then, of course, the calibrated date is
11 available to the councils and the commissions to
12 make decisions, start discussions around
13 allocations and whether they want to make any
14 changes to that or not.

15 So, just quickly this give you a
16 snapshot of the stock assessment schedule. The
17 fullest is available on our website
18 countmyfish.NOAA.gov. The key ones, like I
19 mentioned, are Striped Bass and Summer Flounder.
20 We also have South Atlantic Black Sea Bass and
21 several others that coming up here in the next six
22 months to nine months.

1 So, just a few key takeaways. The first
2 we see a really substantial change in effort with
3 the transition to the mail-based survey. That is
4 particularly apparent with the shore-based mode.
5 Therefore, those stocks that have a higher
6 proportion of catch from more are more highly
7 impacted. We've spent quite a bit of time talking
8 about that wireless effect. That is the main
9 impact that has happened and that is what is
10 mostly driving those substantial changes that you
11 see in particular in the years since 2000. The
12 2018 catch will be calculated in the same currency
13 as our annual catch limits, like I said. So, it's
14 going to be the apples-to-apples comparison as
15 part of our calculations at the end of the year.

16 And finally, the next step is to get
17 this data incorporated into the stock assessments
18 in order to inform our management moving forward.
19 So, that process is going to be iterative process
20 over the next three years. Those stocks that are
21 able to be assessed here in 2018, we will see
22 likely preliminary management changes in 2019, and

1 we will continue to progress through up until
2 2020, 2021, when all of the stocks that have new
3 calibrated data have been able to have that data
4 incorporated into its stock assessment. And for
5 that time period, for any stock that has not had
6 the calibrated data incorporated into their stock
7 assessment, we will continue to use the CHTS to
8 calculate catch. So, again, making sure we have
9 an apples-to-apples comparison until the
10 calibrated data has been incorporated into a stock
11 assessment. And with that, Dave and I will be
12 happy to answer any questions.

13 CHAIR FELLER: If you have a question,
14 do this. I don't have a question so I'm not doing
15 that. Okay. Peter and then Kellie and then Mike.

16 MR. MOORE: Thank you. So, my question
17 has to do with two of those East Coast species.
18 The Striped Bass and the Black Sea Bass that you
19 mentioned. What I'm interested in is how your --
20 so my understanding is that the Feds are doing the
21 stock assessments on both those species, but those
22 species are managed by ASMFC, right? So, how does

1 that interplay work with ASMFC? Because they also
2 do their own assessments on various species, like,
3 River Herring, for instance. Do they have people
4 working with you on that or is that a function
5 that --

6 MR. VAN VORHEES: So, as Kelly pointed
7 out, the transition team that we formed to manage
8 this transition and the development of the
9 calibration and application of them to revise a
10 time series of catch estimates, had members from
11 the commission, from the Atlantic States
12 Commission, the Gulf States Marine Fisheries
13 Commission, Dave can attest to, and also, a number
14 of state agencies as well as the councils who are
15 represented on that team. So, the estimates that
16 we're providing, these revised estimates as a
17 result of applying the calibrations, are being
18 provided to all of our partners for use in stock
19 assessments. So, ASMFC with certainly have and
20 have these calibrated already and are using them
21 in the assessment that they're leading for striped
22 bass. Also, for Summer Flounder I think you know

1 there is a partner where both the council and the
2 commissioner involved are working with our agency
3 on assessment for Summer Flounder. There are
4 benchmark assessments in progress for both those
5 species right now. So, they are using the
6 calibrated estimates at this time.

7 MS. DENIT: And then, the second part of
8 your question Peter, then the results of those
9 stock assessments, which are both being
10 collaboratively between Feds and folks from the
11 commission will then feed into the management
12 process, the council, and commission process and
13 so we expect to have the final assessments
14 presented early in 2019 both to the commission as
15 well as the Mid Atlantic Council or the South
16 Atlantic Council for Southern Black Sea Bass. And
17 then that will form conversations that those
18 bodies to make any management changes or not based
19 on the results of those assessments.

20 MR. MOORE: So, your survey, are they
21 Federal Waters catches or are they Federal and
22 State Waters catches when you survey these people?

1 I mean, do they identify where they actually
2 caught that fish?

3 MR. VAN VORHEES: Yeah. The surveys are
4 designed to collect data for both fishing in State
5 Waters and Federal Waters so it's all salt water
6 including brackish water up into streams coming
7 down the coast. So, yes. So, full coverage of
8 both State and Federal.

9 MR. MOORE: Thank you.

10 CHAIR FELLER: Kellie.

11 MS. RALSTON: Thank you. I had a quick
12 question for you regarding how the recalibrations
13 are comparing with other external data sources
14 that you might have and specifically, looking at
15 the Gulf where each state has their own kind of
16 individual survey and how those are comparing and
17 where you see differences. How can those be
18 resolved going into this whole stock assessment
19 process that you've outlined?

20 MR. VAN VORHEES: Yes, so first of all I
21 want to point out that it's quite possible more
22 than one statistically valid survey design to

1 measure the same thing, but will consistently
2 provide different answers. Okay. In survey
3 statistics, we try as hard as we can to understand
4 what's driving differences in estimates from
5 different survey designs and we did in this big
6 difference between phone survey and mail survey.
7 But as we're developing other survey designs in
8 the case of the Gulf where MRIP has actually
9 worked cooperatively with the state agencies to
10 develop the supplemental surveys that are focused
11 on the short season Red Snapper fishery so we
12 would get more data on fishing during those short
13 seasons then we would get typically from the
14 general surveys we were doing. It's quite
15 possible and as you know, in some cases we do get
16 different estimates from the supplemental survey
17 for Red Snapper then what we get from the general
18 survey that's going alongside of it. We are
19 currently working right now with our partners to
20 figure out how best to combine the data from the
21 supplemental surveys with the general surveys so
22 we produce one set of estimates that use all of

1 the information in the best way possible. And
2 that's ongoing at the moment so I can't really
3 tell you what the results will be from that.

4 But just coming back to the differences,
5 sometimes you will get differences consistently
6 from two different survey designs that are
7 attributable to biases that you can't really
8 measure in one or both of the surveys. So, you do
9 the best you can to try to understand possible
10 sources of bias because all survey designs make
11 some assumptions that might not always apply and
12 might not always be valid, but it's difficult.
13 You know, sometimes you just have to understand
14 that you're going to get a little bit different
15 estimates from two different surveys and you need
16 to make a choice on other grounds about which is
17 the most sensible approach to use in the
18 long-term. Sometimes things like the costs come
19 into play. The other factors such as response
20 rates to the surveys. All of these can have an
21 influence on the magnitude of the potential
22 biases. So, you try to look at this in that

1 respect where which survey design has more
2 potential for bias given that we can't exactly
3 measure it. So, that's kind of what we're working
4 through right with our Gulf State partners for Red
5 Snapper.

6 And also, in Florida, I think you are
7 aware, the special (inaudible) survey that's done
8 in Florida covers more than just Red Snapper, it
9 covers other Reef Fish species. So, we're going
10 to be working with Florida to figure out how best
11 to combine the data from that Gulf Reef Fish
12 survey with the data we're getting from general
13 surveys that are going alongside.

14 MS. DENIT: And I think to your question
15 about, you know, this ground truthing question
16 that has kind of come up several times in
17 different councils, the answer is yes. For
18 example, you see a dip in effort following the
19 economic downturn in 2010. You see a dip in
20 effort following Catrina. So, you do see some of
21 those larger signals. In addition, some of the
22 councils, Mid Atlantic so far, but I think South

1 Atlantic is also digging into that, they kind of
2 did their own analysis using the Fish and Wildlife
3 Survey information and census data and came up
4 with roughly the same estimates as show up in our
5 Fishing Efforts survey so there has been some
6 efforts to look at kind of ground truthing and
7 putting that in airports what's coming out of the
8 Fishing Efforts Survey and this calibrated data.

9 CHAIR FELLER: I've got Michael and then
10 Robert and then Dave and then Richard, but did you
11 want to say something on this question about with
12 the Gulf States or you want to go in turn?

13 MR. DONALDSON: Well, just to reiterate
14 what Dave said, we're hoping to have kind of a
15 follow-up workshop on looking at the state
16 programs and trying to calibrate those to the
17 MRIP. We're hoping probably mid next year to have
18 a workshop to address those issues. So, we are
19 working, as Dave pointed out, we are working on
20 that.

21 CHAIR FELLER: Great. Mike.

22 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yeah, just attempting

1 to put it into context I'm more familiar with,
2 would these be described as kind of a data poor
3 fishery or from data poor at this point and you're
4 attempting to get the data rich or is --

5 MR. VAN VORHEES: Which species are you
6 talking about?

7 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, any of the ones
8 you mentioned. I mean, would you characterize
9 these as all being data poor at this point and the
10 improvement is to get it to a data rich. That's
11 kind of a terminology I'm used to on the West
12 Coast, I guess.

13 MR. VAN VORHEES: Yes, certainly. The
14 four species that I showed graphs for are species
15 that we get a lot of data so they're not data
16 poor. There are a lot of species that we get a
17 lot of information on because they're common
18 targets for recreational fishing where we conduct
19 the surveys. Those species we generally have more
20 precise statistical estimates of the catch. So,
21 we always provide a catch estimate for species,
22 but along with that we get a measure of the

1 precision of that estimate. It's called a percent
2 standard error. So, if you see on our web site,
3 you'll see the estimate, but you'll also see a
4 PSE, which is a percent standard error. The lower
5 that percent standard error is, the more precise
6 the estimate is. That's an indication that we
7 actually get more data on the species.

8 Other species like Blue Line Tile Fish,
9 for example, is pretty rare in our survey. We
10 don't encounter people to fish for that species
11 very often so there's very little data. The
12 estimates we do produce have a very high percent
13 standard error. So, you know from that measure
14 that this is a species where the data is sparse
15 and so the estimate we provide is potentially more
16 suspect because it could very well be high or low
17 in a given year just because we just didn't get
18 enough data in the random sampling to get a really
19 precise estimate for that species.

20 MS. DENIT: So, to make the analogy kind
21 of to the North Pacific and West because I would
22 of it more -- it's not so much moving something

1 from data poor to data rich. It's more like a
2 refinement within the data. So, for example,
3 like, adding additional sampling stations to a
4 survey. Right. It's improvements to the
5 fundamental science that's supporting as opposed
6 to an effort to shift from -- like a tier 1
7 assessment to a tier 3 or tier 4.

8 CHAIR FELLER: Robert.

9 MR. JONES: Thank you. A comment and
10 then a question. So, first of all, I want to
11 commend the agency on all the work that you're
12 doing on this. I know that it's complex and
13 difficult, but, you know, any time were moving I
14 the direction of, you know, the best available
15 science I think it's a positive step forward and
16 to Dave who's trying to wrangle the Gulf States to
17 figure out getting these state data collection
18 systems calibrate to the Federal system is one
19 thing that is of obvious concern to us as a
20 conservation organization. As we move toward
21 state management of Red Snapper, we're concerned
22 about doing allocations based on, you know, ACL is

1 based on Federal and then having catch data coming
2 in from the states, which have data collection
3 systems which have shown less effort.

4 So, my question in particular, very
5 noticeable in your map, your geography there, is
6 the largest Gulf State is missing and it's like
7 Texas doesn't exist as far as MRIP goes and we
8 move towards the states calibrating to the new FES
9 and head in that direction, my understanding is
10 that Texas is not calculating percent standard
11 error, they're not calculating effort of private
12 docks, and they're not calculating discards and
13 there's not really going to be a change in their
14 data collection system where the other states are
15 beginning to calibrate up to meet. So, I'm
16 wondering how you guys are thinking about
17 addressing that long-term in understanding total
18 effort in the Gulf of Mexico and if there are any
19 plans to sort of have any sort of Federal look at
20 what's happening in Texas or what we can do to
21 better understand what's coming out of the Western
22 Gulf.

1 MR. VAN VORHEES: So, I'll take a shot
2 at that. There are two states that historically
3 have funded their own surveys of recreational
4 fishing where we have not been directly involved
5 in the design of the survey and working closely
6 with them on the estimates coming out of the
7 survey. Texas is one and Alaska is the other. I
8 do want to say, though, that in the that in the
9 Marine Recreational Information Program that we
10 started up back in 2007, we have been talking with
11 both states. We have funded projects that
12 occurred in both states with MRIP funding. So,
13 there is a dialogue and we do talk about how
14 surveys are being done and we are sharing ideas
15 with both Texas Parks and Wildlife and the Alaska
16 folks. And there has been some renewed interest
17 recently on the part of Alaska to be a little bit
18 more involved in MRIP developing a regional
19 implementation plan for the Alaska region.

20 We have had some dialogue with Texas.
21 Dave can talk about this as well. They're
22 interested in actually ramping up the level of

1 sampling during the short season for Red Snapper
2 to get more data and more precise estimates for
3 their surveys. We've also been working with them.
4 A few years ago we talked to them about the
5 possibility of doing the new mail survey in Texas
6 and we actually worked out with them that they
7 were willing to provide their license data that
8 would help us with the sampling we do for the mail
9 survey and we did conduct the fishing effort
10 survey in Texas for one year, 2016, and we are
11 going to be working with Texas Parks and Wildlife
12 staff in the near future to review those results
13 and, you know, see what we learn from that. That
14 could come into play depending on how wants to
15 proceed in terms of how we could to some
16 comparisons of estimates we're getting for the
17 other Gulf States from this new design.

18 CHAIR FELLER: Dave, you have a
19 question.

20 MR. DONALDSON: So, to Robert's question
21 about Texas, we have identified some funds to help
22 them increase their sampling on their essentially

1 their Gulf sites where you would expect to see
2 offshore species. We're working with them and
3 hopefully will have something in place for 2019.

4 CHAIR FELLER: Can I stop you once
5 second Robert. Will you shut microphone off?
6 Thanks.

7 MR. DONALDSON: So, my question is
8 regarding the increase in effort is a significant
9 increase. And, Dave, you mentioned looking at the
10 variables that helped drive those changes and I'm
11 assuming that you guys have looked at that and
12 those are real changes. The effort was already
13 fairly high and how it's even higher and there has
14 been discussions at council meetings and what not
15 that the reality of it just doesn't seem possible
16 to have that many trips and I'm assuming that
17 there's been a lot of investigation on what drove
18 those changes and you presented some of those in
19 the presentation. I guess that's a true statement
20 that you guys investigated that stuff.

21 MR. VAN VORHEES: Yes, we have some file
22 studies to try to understand what's driving this

1 difference between how people respond to a mail
2 survey that comes to their front door versus a
3 telephone call they get that's asking them to
4 cooperate with the survey on the spot. One study
5 we did actually looked at if you use the list of
6 license holders to draw a sample, you could
7 contact them by phone and ask them to respond to
8 questions about their fishing activity in two
9 different ways. One is you could call the
10 household, the phone number that you have a
11 license holder, and just ask whoever answers the
12 phone first your questions. The other treatment
13 is you call the household that comes up and you
14 ask to talk to the license holder in the household
15 and you do the interview with that person. In
16 that pilot study, we found there was a significant
17 difference in the responses we got in the two
18 treatments. When you actually asked for a license
19 holder and got information about the fishing
20 activity in the household, more households
21 reported fishing proportionally. More of the
22 household reported fishing. If you just got the

1 first person that answered the phone and you asked
2 them, the proportion of households that reports
3 fishing was much less. So, we call this a
4 gatekeeper effect. That's the term we came up for
5 it. Basically, whoever is answering the phone
6 first in the household from a typical telephone
7 survey like we did for many years, you can
8 consider that person to be the gatekeeper for the
9 household. It's the person you have to talk to,
10 to get information about the household and if
11 that's person responding differently then other
12 members of the household to questions about
13 activity, that can be what's driving the lower
14 estimates from a telephone survey.

15 Now, even though we saw a significant
16 effect here, it's not sufficient to explain all
17 the difference. It does explain a lot of it so
18 we're continuing to look at other ways we could
19 measure other factors that are coming into play
20 here. Kelly mentioned a few that we have in mind
21 and we've been trying to figure out ways to test
22 the idea if the questionnaire comes into the

1 household, it has a better chance of being shared
2 among members of the household before a decision
3 is made whether to just throw it in the trash or
4 respond to it and send it back.

5 The phone call is a different scenario.
6 I think most of you can understand that. You
7 know, is that person who answers the phone going
8 to be able to talk to everybody in the household
9 immediately? Can they identify who fished in the
10 last two months and who didn't? They may not
11 know. Not everybody in the household may have
12 shared with that individual what they've been
13 doing over the last month or so. So, it's not
14 like the first person you talk to is lying about
15 the household, they just might not know. So
16 that's important.

17 But other things that we can look at to
18 understand the differences, we've looked at
19 designing the mail survey questionnaire so it's
20 just as like that somebody who doesn't fish
21 actually fills it out and completes it and sends
22 it back. We use an incentive for the mail survey.

1 We found in pilot studies that the best incentive
2 was \$2.00. If you just give them \$1.00, it boosts
3 the response rate a little bit, but if they get
4 \$2.00 it's even higher. If you go up to 5 or 10,
5 not that much of change. So, \$2.00 is optimum and
6 we found that it actually increases the efficiency
7 of the survey. We spend less money from the
8 number of households that we get responses from
9 with a \$2.00 incentive. So, it's actually a
10 cheaper way to do the survey and get more data.

11 We also tailored the questionnaire so
12 that we ask questions about other things related
13 to NOAA. The weather, hurricanes, things like
14 that. I don't have the questionnaire right in
15 front of me right now, but it's not just asking
16 about fishing. It also asks about your salt water
17 fishing activity. We also looked into making sure
18 the pilot studies that we were discerning between
19 or that people took fishing trip that might have
20 been fresh water trips instead of salt water trips
21 to be sure we weren't getting people reporting
22 their fresh water trips then salt water, which

1 would also increase the estimates. So, there's a
2 lot of things we're looking into as you've
3 guessed, but we have been able to kind at least
4 the gatekeeper effect is a pretty significant
5 contributor.

6 CHAIR FELLER: Our last two questions
7 are Richard and then Matt and then we'll go to
8 break.

9 MR. YAMADA: My question is more of
10 ignorance on my part about these stocks. So, it's
11 comes from the biology of the fish. In Alaska, we
12 use MSE process where we have a management
13 strategy that we use the biological stock
14 assessment and we do our management based upon
15 that information and it's, you know, done on, you
16 know, as you mentioned, the set line surveys. So,
17 my question is of the stocks you mentioned where
18 we have data that shows that there was an extreme
19 underestimation of harvest, are any of these
20 stocks, stocks of concern or threatened and two,
21 if they are of concern, are you setting your
22 priorities of getting this data based upon that

1 kind of knowledge?

2 MS. DENIT: So, Richard, the four we
3 showed I'm trying to go through in my head, I
4 don't believe any of them are overfished or
5 overfishing and so they're all at least hook and
6 Striped Bass are going to be assessed right now
7 and the prioritization of the stock assessments
8 had more to do with the proportion of recreational
9 catch as opposed to the current status with the
10 transitions team thought being those stocks that
11 have a proportion of recreational catch are
12 therefore going to be more heavily and then
13 therefore we should prioritize those. So, that's
14 how the priority was driven for the timing of the
15 stock assessments.

16 MR. UPTON: Thanks for your
17 presentation. I'll be quick here. So, in terms
18 of the sample size, what is that relative to the
19 total license holders and then what's your
20 response rate? You may have mentioned earlier,
21 but I'm just trying to get a sense of the kind of
22 precision in it and then the follow-up would be

1 how you deal with in certainty. You mentioned
2 some of these different standard deductions of
3 error but it is 10 percent, 20 percent, do you
4 give yourself a buffer? Thanks.

5 MR. VAN VORHEES: So, for the new mail
6 survey compared to the telephone survey it's
7 replacing, the response rates for the telephone
8 survey had gotten to less than 10 percent pretty
9 much across the board in the most recent years.
10 In the new mail survey, we get response rates in
11 the order of 35-40 percent. It varies somewhat
12 from state-to-state and across regions, but it's
13 within that window, 35-40 percent, so we're
14 getting quite a boost in terms of the proportion
15 of people who we're trying to contact that
16 actually respond and tell us whether or not there
17 is fishing activity in their household.

18 So, the samples sizes, you know, we're
19 getting -- I guess we're able to conduct a more
20 efficient survey with a higher response rate. So,
21 for the resources we have to pay for mail survey
22 contacts, a larger proportion of those contacts

1 are actually giving us data. So, in that sense,
2 the effective sample size that we're getting from
3 the mail survey is much higher than what we got
4 from the telephone survey. So, that means for the
5 dollar spent we're getting more precise estimates
6 of effort.

7 MR. UPSON: But in terms, is that 35
8 percent of the license holders or is it 35 percent
9 of the people that your sampling of that subset?

10 MR. VAN VORHEES: I apologize. I forgot
11 to answer that part of your question. The way we
12 actually do the sampling for the mail survey is
13 pretty clever, if I do say so myself. We got help
14 from consultants to point out how to do this. So,
15 we originally, in prior studies, looked at using
16 two different sample frames. One was the license
17 list, list of license holders and their mailing
18 addresses and the other was the post office
19 mailing addresses that could cover everybody.
20 Okay. Everybody the post office delivers to. So,
21 we tested out a dual frame design where you draw
22 samples from both and you have to figure over op

1 is and take that into account when you do your
2 estimates. One of our consultants said, "No,
3 there's a better way to do that." So, what we did
4 is we used the post office list of mailing
5 addresses as our sample frame. We draw a sample.
6 Okay. Let's just say hypothetically were drawing
7 500 addresses to mail to. It's usually much more
8 than that. We then take that list of 500 mailing
9 addresses and we match it against the list of
10 license holder addresses and the ones that match,
11 let's say 200 of them, we keep all of them. The
12 other 300 we take a random subsample of those.
13 Let's say maybe 100. So, we wind up with a sample
14 of 300 mailing addresses, but we essentially have
15 a stratification where we can deal with mailing
16 addresses that match to the license frame with a
17 separate stratum and we can decide to sample that
18 stratum on a higher level of moving forward by the
19 way I just described.

20 So, you're essentially benefiting from
21 having the list of license holders to make the
22 survey more efficient because a lot of our

1 contacts are aimed at households that actually
2 have a known fishing participant or the fact that
3 they either had a license or they registered with
4 the state.

5 CHAIR FELLER: That's it? You're all
6 but standing between us and the break. I'm
7 looking at Robert.

8 MR. JONES: I will be very quick.

9 CHAIR FELLER: Okay.

10 MR. JONES: So, to that point, I think
11 you're probably seeing one of the issues that the
12 recreational subcommittee is looking at ways maybe
13 better to quantify the universe of people that are
14 fishing offshore and I'm wondering -- considering
15 what you just described, does that process that
16 you go improve sampling to reach households that
17 actually have somebody who may be fishing in
18 Federal waters? What your thoughts are about the
19 concept of maybe some extra where that universe
20 was defined. You know, example, Florida and
21 Louisiana have separate offshore permits that help
22 then reach those anglers directly without a lot of

1 the extra steps that you just described and I'm
2 wondering your thoughts about that.

3 MR. VAN VORHEES: So, it is a high prior
4 for MRIP right now to come up with a methodology
5 that we could use moving for measuring
6 participation. That's estimating the total of
7 number of people that participate in a
8 recreational fishery. We have produced
9 participation estimates in the past, but many
10 years when we did the Marine Recreational Fishery
11 Statistics Survey in all states of the US, we had
12 a common methodology to use for generating both
13 the catch and effort estimates and participation
14 estimates. More recent years we don't do the same
15 survey in every state so we don't really have an
16 easy way to come up with comparable estimates of
17 the number of participants across all states.
18 However, we have been working closely with our
19 partners in the US Fish and Wildlife Service. I
20 think most of you are aware, they do a survey
21 every five years that does measure participation
22 in fresh water fishing, salt water fishing,

1 hunting, and wildlife recreation activities.

2 We are going to be looking at combining
3 the survey data that they get with survey data
4 that we get to be able to produce estimates of
5 participation at the state level moving forward
6 that would use a comparable methodology so we can
7 be sure to compare apples-to-apples across states.
8 We haven't developed that yet, but we have had
9 initial discussions with them and we're going to
10 work with them on developing and approach and I
11 think as we do that, we'll be able to share
12 information with the subcommittee on what we're
13 learning from that and what the possibilities are
14 going forward. I do want to emphasize that some
15 people misunderstand. They think that in order to
16 generate an estimate number of trips that we first
17 estimate the number of participants and then we
18 use that to estimate the number of trips. We
19 don't actually do that. Our survey just estimates
20 trips directly. It doesn't generate an estimate
21 of the number of participants. So, we need to
22 develop designed for moving forward that will be

1 consistent and comparable to what they're
2 generating in their survey every five years.

3 CHAIR FELLER: Dave and Kelly, thank you
4 so much for sharing that with us. We're going to
5 go to a break right now. If you come back at
6 10:20. We'll just kind of push it out a little
7 bit and then we'll hear from Rich Cody.

8 (Recess)

9 CHAIR FELLER: Great, thank you, guys.
10 So next up we have Rich Cody; is going to talk to
11 us about electronic rack fishing reporting.

12 MR. CODY: (inaudible) Okay. Hello, my
13 name is Richard Cody. I work with the Office of
14 Science and Technology in support of the MRIP
15 Program, and what I'm doing here today, really, is
16 just to give you an overview of MRIP's involvement
17 in electronic reporting. It's something that's
18 probably less visible to the public than the FES
19 and APAIS work that's been going on over the past
20 few years, but it's also a very important
21 component of some of the work that's been going on
22 with MRIP.

1 So anyway just to briefly give you an
2 overview, MRIP -- and I'm coming from a state
3 perspective. Originally I was with the state of
4 Florida and was involved with the MRIP Program,
5 the improvements that were made over the past few
6 years to get us to the point we're at right now.

7 For many of the participants that were
8 working with the NOAA Fisheries, this was always a
9 collaborative project, and the tendency is to
10 think of -- when you think of MRIP, is just to
11 think of APAIS and the FES and forget about the
12 fact that there are a number of different surveys
13 in which MRIP has had some involvement in over the
14 years, and that it expands both coasts, and in
15 particular with respect to a national
16 certification or certification of the surveys,
17 survey designs.

18 That's something that we've worked
19 closely with our state and regional partners to
20 help the states design surveys that meet their
21 specific needs a little better, and including
22 giving them advice on the type of statistical

1 design features that they're looking for, and to
2 help with the validity of the surveys.

3 So what we have here, really, is just a
4 list of the different surveys that expand both
5 coasts, and right now, for instance, on the West
6 Coast, even though you don't have FES and APAIS,
7 and you don't have the involvement of MRIP in the
8 traditional sense of conducting the actual
9 surveys, you have MRIP involved with the three
10 different programs that are going on in the
11 different states, and right now, for instance,
12 California Recreational Fisheries Surveys (sic)
13 have requested certification, so we're working
14 with them on the certification review for their
15 surveys.

16 On the east coast, you know you've got
17 the APAIS and FES that spans the Atlantic Coast
18 and into most of the Gulf, but you also have state
19 surveys that we've been heavily involved in the
20 development of in recent years as well. So I just
21 wanted to point that out that MRIP really is, it's
22 a cooperative or a collaborative undertaking.

1 It's not just dealing with the two main surveys
2 that you hear about on a regular basis.

3 So Dave and Kellie already showed you
4 this slide here that shows how we estimate total
5 recreational catch, and from this slide you can
6 see basically that there are two components.
7 There's an effort component and a catch rate
8 component, and in the traditional sense of
9 complemented surveys, which we have with the FES
10 and with the APAIS survey, you get one survey
11 accounting for the effort part and then one survey
12 independently accounting for the catch rate part,
13 so when you get those two components and you
14 multiply them together you get total catch.

15 There are other approaches as well where
16 you can combine both of these into a single
17 survey, or a single component, and then have a way
18 to validate that recorded information, and that's
19 a census-based approach that's a little bit
20 different, but I refer to it because it's
21 something that we've been working on in terms of
22 electronic reporting as vital to the methods for

1 electronic reporting.

2 So I mentioned a little bit about state
3 certification or certification of state surveys,
4 and I mentioned also about the Gulf surveys,
5 working with the Gulf states on some of their
6 surveys to get better estimates of red snapper,
7 more timely and more precise estimates. And so we
8 have worked over the past few years with states of
9 Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida, and
10 also to a lesser extent with Texas as Dave pointed
11 out earlier as well. And over the past few years,
12 we've been able to give some guidance on the
13 design and development of their state surveys to
14 get better information.

15 What we have here is, I mentioned about
16 the complemented survey design. You have here the
17 LA Creel survey, and this is a general survey.
18 This is really taking over from MRIP, or the
19 APAIS, in the state of Louisiana, is now their
20 general survey method for getting catch and effort
21 estimates for the entire state. And in Florida,
22 we have the Gulf Reef Fish Survey. These three

1 other surveys here are what we call supplemental
2 surveys in that they don't replace MRIP, they
3 supplement MRIP in getting information. So you
4 have MRIP that's conducted at the same time as
5 these surveys, and then you have the state surveys
6 being conducted to get additional information.

7 So with the Gulf Reef Fish Survey
8 similar to the LA Creel, it's sort of a
9 complemented design as well. You've got an effort
10 component based on the list, and then you've got a
11 catch component based on dockside intercepts, so
12 they combine to get a catch estimate. I'll get a
13 little bit into the details of that later, but
14 this is something that the Gulf Reef Fish Survey
15 design is actually integrated into the MRIP survey
16 design. So it's a component of the actual draw.
17 So the draw is basically dependent on the APAIS
18 draw. So there's a tight relationship there
19 between these two surveys.

20 With the other two, Mississippi Tails n'
21 Scales and the Alabama Snapper Check, this is
22 where our electronic reporting approach comes into

1 focus, and although these are performing the same
2 function as the Gulf Reef Fish Survey
3 supplementing MRIP, the approach is a little bit
4 different. You're basically using electronic
5 reporting to get at that information rather than
6 complemented surveys.

7 So state surveys using electronic
8 reporting, as I mentioned earlier, they're there
9 to supplement MRIP access point and your intercept
10 survey, or APAIS. They're not there to replace
11 them. The goal for these surveys is to produce
12 more accurate and timely recreational catch
13 estimates for red snapper. At least that's the
14 initial goal. And there are some considerations
15 of expanding these surveys to include other
16 species. But right now, certification for these
17 surveys pertains to red snapper catch only.

18 So the difference that I want to
19 emphasize throughout this is that this is a
20 census-based approach, so it differs from our
21 traditional sampling approach where we sample
22 catch dockside, or we sample households for

1 effort, in that it uses a list to perform a
2 census, and that list really is the basis for the
3 survey approach. But it doesn't dispense with the
4 idea that you need a dockside validation. So the
5 dockside component in the regular MRIP, APAIS is
6 to get catch information. The dockside component
7 for these specialized surveys really serves to
8 validate what's reported by the anglers, and to
9 get an idea of any corrections that might need to
10 be made, or adjustments made to those estimates
11 that are produced from reporting.

12 So the approach that we've been looking
13 at, and this has been a very collaborative kind of
14 an undertaking involving MRIP consultants,
15 independent statistical consultants, the states
16 and also the Commission, and what we've looked at
17 over the past three or four years for these two
18 designs are what we call a capture-recapture
19 survey design. And so it's a well-known
20 methodology, and I'll get a little bit into that
21 later on. But for electronic reporting, it's
22 something that works very well when you're dealing

1 with list-based reporting.

2 So the angler reports are considered the
3 capture phase. So that's your initial capture
4 phase of the effort and catch that you would be
5 interested in. Then you have dockside surveys
6 which function as a recapture phase, so this is
7 the part that, you know, is not often given the
8 attention that it probably should be, but this is
9 a very important part of the overall design.

10 So capture-recapture survey design is
11 basically these are well-established methods.
12 Generally they're used for, you know, ecological
13 and epidemiological applications. One of the ones
14 that you hear about quite a bit is in validation,
15 all patient registries and things like that. So
16 when it comes to looking at incidences of diseases
17 in different regions, that's the type of
18 information and where there may be more than one
19 source of information, so they're used often in
20 those kind of applications. It's well established
21 and it's been around for a while.

22 Now, as I mentioned, the capture phase,

1 the anglers would report shrimp and catch
2 information via an app or other means, it just
3 depends. It isn't the prerequisite for electronic
4 reporting, but you can use it with other methods
5 of reporting as well. And then the capture phase,
6 really, this is the dockside sampling of the
7 fishing trips. So the thing about this is that
8 unlike the traditional catch and effort Surveys
9 that we're familiar with, or for MRIP, where both
10 phases, or both surveys, are probability based,
11 there's only really a requirement for
12 probability-based sampling for the recapture phase
13 in the capture-recapture design. So that's one
14 thing that is good to point out.

15 So you don't have to have perfect
16 information for the reporting phase, but you do
17 have to make some assumptions, and some of these
18 assumptions I'll just refer to here. The
19 assumption is that the main one, is that the
20 capture and recapture events are independent, and
21 what that means is that what an angler reports
22 initially is not impacted by the recapture phase

1 or when he's interviewed at dockside. So ideally
2 you'd want them to report before they are
3 intercepted dockside.

4 So if you had a reporting requirement,
5 for instance, for a trip and it meant that you
6 didn't report it or you forgot to report it and
7 you landed dockside and someone interviewed you,
8 the independence would be questionable in that
9 case because that might be what prompted you to
10 report. So there may be a difference or there may
11 be a bias in what's reported under those kinds of
12 circumstances. So basically that's one of the
13 underlying, or major underlying assumptions.

14 One-hundred percent compliance is not
15 required for the surveys, so you don't have to
16 have complete reporting for the methodology to
17 work, however the performance of the methodology
18 improves as compliance improves. So the more
19 reporting you have, the better chance that the
20 recapture phase will perform adequately. So the
21 ability to match capture and recapture events is
22 critical to the effectiveness of the method, and

1 I'll refer to this, and just keep this in mind as
2 we kind of go through this, that that sounds like
3 something that wouldn't be too hard to accomplish,
4 but it actually is something that we found through
5 our involvement with these surveys, and then a
6 couple of other pilots in the Gulf and South
7 Atlantic, that depending on the approach you use,
8 it may be, you know, a difficult undertaking.

9 So the first survey I'll refer to is
10 Mississippi Tails 'n Scales, and they were
11 certified -- the methodology was certified earlier
12 this year, and it's not important that you can
13 read this graph here. It's basically something I
14 just pulled from their website, and what it does
15 is it just basically tells you that there's more
16 than one way to report. They have an Android app,
17 or iPhone app, and then they have also a website
18 and they have a phone number. So there's
19 different methods that they use, and they combine
20 them to get at the information that they need.

21 Also another important thing about their
22 system is that for compliance purposes, law

1 enforcement as well as the scientists have access
2 to the data and so they can see information that
3 will tell them something about the trip or the
4 reporting habits of the angler they may meet in
5 the field and that's important as you'll see later
6 on. But the few things I'd point out about this
7 is that it's a (inaudible) to find angler
8 universe, and I know there's some interest from
9 the recreational subgroup on how do you best set
10 up a participation for this type of an endeavor,
11 basically, and how do you approve participation,
12 or maintain participation.

13 So for the Mississippi Tails n' Scales,
14 they have a very high compliance rate in terms of
15 reporting. It's greater than 80 percent, up to 85
16 percent at this point, which is very high. So for
17 their recapture phase, that gives them a lot of
18 data to work with. When they go out in the field,
19 you know, they can hit anglers that you're pretty
20 sure they reported. And part of what I'd point
21 out to you is that with -- obviously compliance
22 has an enforcement part that may impact the level

1 of compliance, and the state is very willing to
2 point out that they have some things in their
3 favor in terms of geography, and also the size of
4 the fishery when it comes to enforcing compliance,
5 so I'll refer to that a little bit later.

6 But one of the big selling features, or
7 one of the things that the consultants were very
8 positive on, was the fact that you could
9 technically have 100-percent matching of the trip
10 information reported by the anglers versus what
11 you're trying to recapture in the field. So you
12 have a trip identification number, and this is key
13 to the success of their design, in my opinion, and
14 the trip identification number is used to match
15 the capture and recapture phases.

16 So for each trip as angler has to obtain
17 a trip identification number prior to going on the
18 trip. So once he gets that number, he has it, and
19 he can't get another number until he closes it
20 out, so he has to report that trip before he can
21 obtain another trip identification number that
22 allows him to go fishing again for red snapper.

1 So that's an important feature of their design and
2 I think that which makes it a little bit unique.
3 There is the potential there for a hundred-percent
4 matching of trips.

5 And I mentioned that the trip has to be
6 closed out before a new number is obtained, you
7 know. And according to Mississippi DMR folks,
8 they basically have said that less than five
9 percent of the expired trip numbers end up being
10 expired, so they don't get reported. One of the
11 worries was that towards the end of the season
12 when you get a trip number that, "Well, what's the
13 point in reporting; you know, I came in and nobody
14 was there at dockside, so, you know, I'll just let
15 it run out and if I have to report next year, I
16 will." So one of the things about this is that
17 very few anglers apparently do this. They tend to
18 close out their trips, and part of the reason for
19 this is that the way Mississippi has set reporting
20 up, is that even for next season, if you haven't
21 closed out your trips from the previous season,
22 you can't get a trip identification number. So

1 it's not just limited to one season, it continues.

2 Another feature of it is that it is
3 fairly labor intensive in terms of the amount of
4 effort that the state puts into it. They do a
5 daily sample draw of public access sites, and that
6 requires quite a bit of effort to conduct and also
7 to, you know, maintain current pressure estimates
8 for the draw. But that's something that they do,
9 that they feel it gives them a much better handle
10 on fishing activity and much better representation
11 of the trips.

12 I pointed out earlier about enforcement
13 being helped by geography and then also by the
14 size of the fishery. The only thing that
15 Mississippi has -- I don't know that we can call
16 it "going for them," -- but traditionally because
17 Mississippi is generally a smaller area with very
18 few sites that target red snapper, their
19 contribution to the overall catch for the
20 Gulf-Wide fishery is, you know, around five-
21 percent or less, so it's a small component of the
22 overall red snapper catch.

1 One thing that's been pointed out for us
2 is that in terms of enforcement, that works in
3 their favor in that there are not that many
4 anglers out there to check on; you know, you don't
5 have to have an awful lot of enforcement resources
6 to maintain fairly high compliance. The other
7 thing is that their geography basically sets it up
8 so that there are only really a few egress points
9 to get to open water, so law enforcement can take
10 advantage of that geographic feature to enforce
11 compliance.

12 And then as I said, they have access to
13 the trip identification numbers, so they can see
14 if an angler has reported or not, and when they
15 see them on the water, they can see if they have
16 an actual trip identification number, and if they
17 haven't, you know, they get a ticket. And they
18 have been very aggressive in the fee structure for
19 their tickets. It's not a small ticket, so they
20 use that, I think, too, as part of their funding.

21 So Alabama Snapper Check uses a slightly
22 different approach, although this is also a

1 capture-recapture methodology as well, and some of
2 you are probably familiar with the app that they
3 have. Like Mississippi, they have an app, but
4 it's a little bit different. This is also based
5 on a licensed defined angler universe, so you have
6 a list of anglers that they can draw from.
7 Compliance in 2016 was around 31 to 35 percent
8 which is not where you want it to be. You want it
9 to be a little bit higher than that. But as I
10 said, you know, for the capture-recapture
11 methodology, full compliance is not a requirement.
12 Obviously the performance of the methodology
13 improves as compliance improves.

14 So part of the reason for this -- and
15 when we talked to Alabama Department of
16 Conservation and Natural Resources they've told us
17 that their approach has been a little bit more on
18 the educational side. They've tried to introduce
19 this state survey more gradually than Mississippi
20 has. So they haven't been as aggressive in terms
21 of ticketing people that don't comply. They've
22 tried to do it as a more of an educational type of

1 an endeavor. And part of that is because, you
2 know, there is limited support for that approach
3 in their legislature.

4 But as I said, you know, education has
5 been the way that they've approached -- for 2017,
6 and I don't have numbers in front of me, but I
7 have talked to several people involved with the
8 survey from Alabama, and they've said that they
9 anticipate that they'll be able to report much
10 higher compliance rates. I'm not sure what
11 exactly that means in terms of -- but better than
12 35 percent. And they use a weekly sample draw of
13 red snapper sites, so these are sites where likely
14 red snapper trips would originate from.

15 Now, and unlike Mississippi, there is no
16 unique trip identification number, and this is
17 where the challenge comes in in terms of trying to
18 match the capture phase, the reported trip, with
19 what you intercept on the ground and making sure
20 that you have some reliability to the match there.
21 So I've given you kind of a broad overview of the
22 two survey methods. They have a lot of

1 similarities, but they use, you know, distinctly
2 different approaches in terms of how they're set
3 up, how the trip information is collected, and how
4 they approach compliance.

5 And here's some of the things that we've
6 learned from this. You have different trip
7 matching approaches, as I've said, to test this
8 independence assumption. As I said, you know, an
9 underlying assumption of this whole methodology is
10 that what's reported in the initial phase is
11 independent of what you get in the field. It's
12 not something that was stimulated by your
13 interaction with a sampler in the field. So that
14 can lead to bias.

15 But again, you know, that's something
16 that would have to be looked at in some cases. It
17 may not be the case. It may be that, you know,
18 you have likely reporters, but that, you know, for
19 one reason or another they may forget to report,
20 and, you know, they get a reminder from somebody
21 that meets them in the field to collect
22 information, but, again, you know, it doesn't mean

1 that it would be different, but the potential for
2 bias is there.

3 So the different approaches that we've
4 looked at, you know, obviously are the unique trip
5 number, and then the other way that Alabama uses
6 is basically matching criteria. So what they do
7 is try to match up the time of the interview and
8 the date and the place with what's reported by an
9 angler. So there's a certain amount of play when
10 it comes to your ability to match that
11 information. Obviously they may report, you know,
12 in and around the time. There may be some
13 discrepancies between the times, so what the
14 approach has been used here is, that a window is
15 assigned to what's considered independent trip
16 information.

17 So around the time of the trip report,
18 they'll match trips based on the time of the trip,
19 and you can expand that or shrink it and get
20 vastly different estimates. So using that method,
21 it's very sensitive to producing estimates, so
22 depending on how you match, you know, can

1 dramatically influence the type of information
2 that you get in terms of estimates. So that's
3 something to consider.

4 The different approaches to compliance,
5 as I mentioned, you have the Mississippi approach
6 which is just strict enforcement with penalties.
7 You also have a very limited area, too, a limited
8 fishery to deal with. Alabama, you know, it's a
9 considerable law enforcement terrain to adequately
10 enforce a compliance. So what they've done is a
11 more educational or gradual enforcement of
12 penalties in the hopes that as the anglers become
13 more and more familiar with the reporting
14 requirements and with the dockside sampling, then
15 that compliance will improve.

16 Cost varies depending on the approach
17 used as you can imagine, and then that also the
18 (inaudible)) as I mentioned, you know, Mississippi
19 is always willing to point out that they have some
20 things in their favor that Alabama doesn't, and
21 currently, you know, supplemental surveys do not
22 provide full coverage of the red snapper fishery.

1 So that's another thing that we've been working
2 with the states to try and improve and address.

3 For instance, with MRIP, with the APAIS,
4 you get information on discards as well as the
5 harvested component, and initially with these
6 survey designs, the amount of information that was
7 being provided on discards was limited, and the
8 states are working with those to improve that
9 coverage. So you don't get 100-percent coverage
10 of the fishery at this point in time, but it's
11 something that, as I said, the states are working
12 on to improve.

13 And then also what I've heard recently
14 is -- well, and this is really going back to the
15 recent council meeting -- I heard some concerns
16 about the exploitability of this methodology. So
17 basically there is incentive for an angler to
18 report zero because it might mean that the fishery
19 stays open longer. So what we've heard from, you
20 know, some anglers is, you know, that they have
21 experienced situations where that might be an
22 issue. Also, again, you don't have coverage of

1 the private access component of the fishery, which
2 you don't have in APAIS either, but in this case
3 you would have to assume that reporting rates are
4 the same for both the public access anglers that
5 you intercept in the field and the private access
6 anglers. So these are just some of the lessons
7 that we've learned.

8 So what does this mean in terms of the
9 utility of electronic reporting? Well, we think
10 we have a very robust methodology. The
11 capture-recapture design that we've been working
12 with the states on is, I think, working out, you
13 know, pretty well in terms of its validity. It's
14 a sound methodology. Obviously it has a few
15 underlying assumptions that can affect the quality
16 of the information that you get from the approach.

17 So there are some management
18 considerations I wanted to point out in terms of
19 states getting into the business of conducting
20 specialized surveys as supplements or as general
21 survey alternatives. It does involve a change in
22 methodology, and as you saw with Dave and Kellie's

1 presentation on the FES and the APAIS, you need a
2 calibration when you've changed methodologies,
3 specifically if it's fairly substantial. So you
4 need a calibration so that when you compare
5 historical information with what you have now,
6 you're doing an apples-to-apples comparison.

7 So in this, I guess, endeavor I'll call
8 it again, we've been working closely with the
9 states on how best to transition to their surveys
10 in terms of integrating the catch information and
11 effort information into MRIP. And then also ways
12 to calibrate the information so that we can
13 maintain a viable, valid time series. So, you
14 know, obviously if you are -- there are some
15 considerations when you have a number of different
16 surveys; it may be that one calibration doesn't
17 fit all the surveys. You may have to have
18 separate calibrations for each survey. So that
19 presents some challenges in terms of how you want
20 to proceed with the information that you have and
21 how you would use the state information.

22 So right now, we're working with the

1 states and I think Dave referred to this a little
2 bit earlier, we conducted a workshop in New
3 Orleans earlier, you know, in September, and the
4 whole focus of that workshop was to get the states
5 thinking about how to proceed. Now that they have
6 their survey designs implemented and that they are
7 getting catch information from those surveys, how
8 do we best incorporate that information into the
9 assessment process and the management process.

10 So the workshop, itself, focused on two
11 different areas, basically integration of the
12 catch and effort information, and then a
13 calibration. And as I mentioned before, you know,
14 the state surveys don't provide a complete
15 picture. So they only provide part of what we
16 need. So there is a need right now to get that
17 extra information that we need from MRIP, and so
18 you have to find some way of integrating those
19 estimates to come up with a complete picture of
20 catch.

21 So right now, the states have, actually
22 just yesterday, provided us with some of the catch

1 and effort information that they have produced for
2 the past couple of years, and the consultants will
3 start evaluation of those data to see how best to
4 integrate those. And they're looking at one
5 method in particular that shows promise, and
6 that's something called "composite estimation".
7 So depending on how precise your data is, it gets
8 weighted differently in the method. So if you
9 have very imprecise data, that would be weighted
10 pretty low of terms of its impact on the overall
11 catch estimate. And so this has promise because
12 it gives us a way to weight the data from both
13 surveys MRIP and the states are raising to come up
14 with a more complete picture.

15 And then the other component that was
16 looked at in the workshop was calibration, and
17 obviously you have to figure out what you're going
18 to do with -- what estimates you're going to
19 produce first before you can proceed with the
20 calibration method. So that's where we are right
21 now in that process. I thought I'd just elaborate
22 what Dave had already presented.

1 So as far as other survey, or
2 electronic-based surveys or app-based surveys that
3 are out there, one that's gotten a fair bit of
4 attention in the last year or so is the
5 MyFishCount app that's being used by the South
6 Atlantic Fisheries Management Council, and this
7 was really more of an experimental approach,
8 seeing what they could get from an app in terms of
9 information that might help inform management
10 decisions.

11 So what they looked at was getting more
12 details on actual trip and catch information that
13 they could look at or summarize regionally if they
14 had enough information. So right now on their
15 website they have information that's posted that
16 summarizes some of this information. But I will
17 point out that, you know, unlike Tails n' Scales
18 and Snapper Check, this is basically a voluntary
19 type of project at this point.

20 So you have a partnership that they've
21 developed with the Snook and Gamefish Foundation
22 which is very active in Florida. You might have

1 heard of their iAngler app, and that's one that
2 I'll refer to a little bit later. We have done an
3 MRIP pilot study on the iAngler app as well. So
4 South Atlantic Council, as I said, have
5 partner-shipped with Snook and Gamefish
6 Foundation. They've also been participating in
7 the transition process and looking at the state
8 surveys in terms of the certified Gulf state
9 surveys and were participants in the workshop I
10 just talked about. So they are keeping up with
11 those methodologies in the hope that it can help
12 inform the process that they're looking at.

13 Now, the data that's presented here,
14 it's just for illustration purposes. You know,
15 they do a very simplified type of a thing where
16 they, you know, may present information on the
17 conditions or release catch, the composition of
18 catch, things like that. It doesn't tell you much
19 about where the information came from in terms of
20 geographic region. They have the capability to do
21 that, but it's very basic straightforward kind of
22 information that really is to help improve

1 compliance or participation with the project.

2 So catch and effort information, as I
3 said, is summarized and it's published at the
4 council website, and they have plans to look at
5 other species to include reporting for other
6 species. But this is something that, you know,
7 it's fairly recent. They don't have a guaranteed
8 source of funding. They're looking at different
9 options for funding, going forward. But it's a
10 voluntary reporting method. It doesn't have
11 validation like I explained for Snapper Check and
12 Tails 'n Scales, so it's completely dependent on
13 what's reported by the anglers.

14 I was hoping to have a couple of reports
15 and I talked to Dave. We wanted to have them
16 posted on the website today, but they're in the
17 process of going through IQA evaluations and they
18 will be posted within the next couple of weeks,
19 probably, but I can make available PDFs of those
20 reports to the recreational workgroup so you can
21 take a look. And a couple of these reports, one
22 I'll refer to right here is one that I was

1 involved in when I was with the state of Florida,
2 and this is a general assessment of angler apps to
3 provide information that could be used for
4 management or staff assessment purposes.

5 But we worked with Rob Ahrens out of
6 University of Florida, and Rob basically worked
7 with the Snook and Gamefish Foundation, the same
8 people that are working with the South Atlantic
9 Council right now, to obtain information that
10 they've been collecting for a number of years, and
11 Rob did a fairly straightforward study. He used
12 some novel methods in comparing the data from MRIP
13 but with the data that's provided by the app, and
14 I won't get into the details of it, but I will,
15 you know, just mention a couple of important
16 considerations, because one thing is that you will
17 hear is that participation or maintaining
18 participation using angler apps is a difficult
19 process. It's not something that once you put an
20 app in somebody's hand, you're good to go.
21 There's a lot of maintenance in terms of
22 maintaining the level of participation to get the

1 data you need.

2 So what he found is that overall for
3 iAngler, which is probably one of the better known
4 apps, that participation really drops off
5 dramatically after just a couple of uses. So you
6 get anglers, they're interested for once or twice,
7 and then once that happens, they're not using it
8 anymore, and after a period of about two years
9 there's complete turnover of the actual angler
10 universe using the app. So the people that
11 started two years ago are no longer using it.
12 It's another group of anglers, a different group.

13 One thing that Brett Fitzgerald from the
14 Snook and Gamefish Foundation pointed out to me is
15 that also the AC spikes in subscriptions
16 associated with environmental events like fish
17 tills, things like that. And once anglers figure
18 out that, you know, this isn't for that, they drop
19 using it. So there is some -- obviously even
20 though this is a pretty well-known app, there's
21 some information lacking in terms of communication
22 with anglers about the actual focus of the app.

1 But anyway, as I pointed out, you know,
2 you've got high turnover, but one of the things
3 that was pointed out in Rob's study is that
4 avidity bias is demonstrated for the app, so you
5 tend to have more avid anglers that use the app
6 and report. So that would give you a different --
7 it wouldn't be representative of the angling
8 population in general. You'd have a more avid
9 group of anglers than you would expect, in
10 general.

11 There are some challenges that he
12 pointed out as well in terms of the spatial and
13 temporal resolution of the information that you
14 can get from the app. He didn't recommend it on a
15 state-wide level, but he said it had some
16 applications on a regional level. Ironically,
17 though, for this app, the species that they looked
18 at were Snook, obviously, Red Drum, Spotted Sea
19 Trout, in particular, were all species that we get
20 pretty good information already at MRIP, and most
21 of the state's wildlife agencies, particularly
22 Florida, anyway, will tell you that, you know,

1 MRIP information for Spotted Sea Trout and Red
2 Drum is pretty good. So, you know, for the less
3 common species, you know, that wasn't the case.
4 The information that they looked at didn't seem to
5 bear through.

6 So these are just a couple of the high
7 points of the report that was turned in. One
8 other thing I'll mention as well is that even
9 though this is probably one of the more
10 established apps out there, Rob Ahrens felt like
11 they had to combine years to get enough to compare
12 with a single year estimates from MRIP, so, you
13 know, even within a year, the data were pretty
14 limited and sparse, and then they were regionally
15 concentrated as well, as you would expect. This
16 is something that started in southeast and
17 southwest Florida, you know, a few years back,
18 and, you know, Snook Fishery is generally located
19 in that area also. So it does have some regional
20 limitations.

21 So that's what I wanted to point out to
22 you. The other report that I'll just briefly

1 mention here, and I'll try to provide it to the
2 Working Group, is a report by Mike Brick and this
3 is something that MRIP commissioned Mike to take
4 on, and this was basically a status or a state of
5 the union in terms of electronic reporting
6 methodologies and their use in surveys, the
7 potential versus the reality of their use. So
8 I'll have that for the Working Group to look at.

9 So that's basically it. You know, I
10 kept it to just two of the state surveys that
11 we're heavily involved in in terms of
12 certification and then the design and
13 implementation of the surveys. I did just provide
14 the example from the South Atlantic Council and
15 then the report that has just come out, but
16 obviously there are other apps out there used for
17 different purposes. I concentrated on the ones
18 that are more relevant to recreational catch.

19 CHAIR FELLER: Great. Thank you. I've
20 got Robert and then Joe and then Stephanie, and
21 then Peter and then Rai.

22 MR. JONES: Thank you, Rich, a great

1 presentation. As you know the Recreational
2 Subcommittee is tackling this subject as well and
3 so I have two quick follow-up questions for you.
4 So Michael Christopher at Elemental Methods built
5 the original iAngler and that's kind of been the
6 platform for most of these apps that you talked
7 about in quoting Tails n' Scales and Snapper
8 Check, iSnapper. With that in mind, I wonder if
9 the difference that you highlighted in compliance
10 rates between Tails n' Scales and Snapper Check,
11 if you have looked at if maybe there is some part
12 of the app design, itself, the functionality, that
13 might have influenced the compliance rate --

14 MR. CODY: Mm-hmm.

15 MR. JONES: -- because one of the issues
16 that we're tackling in the Subcommittee is, you
17 know, looking up best practices on app design, as
18 well, in order to boost response and compliance.

19 MR. CODY: Yeah, that's something that
20 we haven't personally looked at. I know there's
21 been quite a bit of interaction between
22 Mississippi DMR and Alabama Department of

1 Conservation and Natural Resources, you know, on
2 their specific or their particular apps. I'm not
3 sure that they've looked at design features that
4 would make one more favorable for reporting over
5 the other. As I've said, you know, Mississippi
6 put such an emphasis on compliance from the very
7 beginning, and, you know, they took advantage of
8 things like social media for anglers' reporting,
9 tickets, and the tickets are fairly costly, that
10 they think worked in their favor also, so that
11 would be something definitely to look at in terms
12 of a comparison between all the different
13 platforms that are out there, really, to see what
14 features seem to work better.

15 MR. JONES: Thanks. It's probably
16 mostly accounted for in the difference in the
17 regulatory environments there --

18 MR. CODY: Yeah.

19 MR. JONES: -- that you just outlined.
20 I guess a follow-up to that would be, I wonder if
21 you have taken a look at any differences in places
22 where apps are being used in compliance rates on

1 the statutory requirement for when the reporting
2 has to occur, and I'll give you an example: So
3 for the electronic log books that are looking to
4 be implemented in the Southeast and the Atlantic
5 for their for hire sector, they're going to have
6 to submit the reports before they unload fish from
7 the boat.

8 MR. CODY: Mm-hmm.

9 MR. JONES: But there's also big
10 differences on the private angler side about, you
11 know, some of them you can report your catch up to
12 three or four days later, some of them --

13 MR. CODY: Yeah.

14 MR. JONES: -- it seems like it's in
15 within a 24-hour period, and I wonder if you have
16 any feedback about that sweet spot, there, for
17 when the report has to be submitted.

18 MR. CODY: Yeah, well, if you use the
19 capture-recapture methodology, ideally you'd want
20 it reported before you would intercept the angler
21 dockside. So you would really want them to report
22 it as they're on their way in, before they know

1 they're even going to be intercepted, and that
2 kind of takes care of that independence assumption
3 mostly.

4 I think as far as compliance is
5 concerned, I'm not sure that we've done any, you
6 know, real comparison in terms of what works and
7 what doesn't. We do have some experience, for
8 instance, with the Southeast Regional Head Boat
9 Survey where they improve compliance, you know,
10 through a fairly intensive undertaking of, you
11 know, sending out letters if they didn't report by
12 certain times and making sure the head-boat fleet
13 really was onboard. But they had fleet size in
14 their favor, so you're talking about a hundred
15 boats versus, you know, several thousand boats.

16 So I think that's where the issue lies.
17 I think at some stage, you know -- and there is a
18 process ongoing right now in the Southeast looking
19 at reporting options and methods to validate that
20 the time to report the trip will have to become a
21 consideration in terms of how you want to
22 validate. So I know they are looking at that in

1 the SEFHEIR process right now for the South
2 Atlantic.

3 MR. JONES: Thank you.

4 CHAIR FELLER: So you guys, we are
5 substantially over time on this agenda item, so
6 I'm going to beg your forbearance and suggest
7 we've got time at 2:45 when the Recreational
8 Subcommittee meets and Rich will be there, so can
9 I ask you guys who have your cards up right now if
10 you could take your questions to that because our
11 speakers for the next panel are sitting here
12 waiting and they're supposed to go before
13 lunchtime. So I'd like to move on to the next
14 item and then we can come back to this stuff this
15 afternoon and then also probably when the Rec
16 Committee reports out later on in the meeting.
17 Okay? Thanks, Rich.

18 And I think next we have -- let me get
19 -- Dan Namur and Cliff Cosgrove who are going to
20 talk about (inaudible) Saltonstall-Kennedy.

21 MR. CODY: Sounds great.

22 CHAIR FELLER: I love talking about

1 grants.

2 MR. NAMUR: Okay. (Laughter) Are we
3 good? And just arrows work?

4 CHAIR FELLER: Yeah.

5 MR. NAMUR: All right. All right, good
6 morning. Hopefully I can squeeze this in in a
7 reasonable amount of time so folks can go get
8 their lunch and not get too cranky. My name is
9 Dan Namur. I oversee the grants enterprise here
10 at the National Marine Fisheries Service and a
11 portion of that is the Saltonstall-Kennedy
12 Program, and I've been asked to discuss that with
13 you as well today. But I'll try to put it in the
14 framework of our larger grants enterprise to give
15 you guys an idea of where that falls. If it's all
16 right with the Chair, questions can come in during
17 the presentation, if that works?

18 CHAIR FELLER: That's on you.

19 MR. NAMUR: Okay.

20 CHAIR FELLER: Yep.

21 MR. NAMUR: So, moving along. So
22 financial assistance, fancy way of saying grants,

1 the National Marine Fisheries Service does ballpark
2 700 a year, which is about \$400-million, so it's a
3 large investment. It's about a third of our
4 budget every year that goes out externally in the
5 form of grants. If you take a quick look-see at
6 kind of the way NMFS operational budget works, on
7 the far right-hand side you can see that the
8 grants portion of that, and then you can kind of
9 see how everything else falls out.

10 Though I'm not going to talk about it
11 today, you can see that if you add grants and
12 contracts, which is also external, you're looking
13 at close to two-thirds of our budget each year is
14 going out externally.

15 Most of you are pretty familiar where we
16 work, so you can see here the way that we're set
17 up with our regions and our science centers in
18 that we hit quite a few states around the country,
19 and the way that we distribute our funds, you can
20 see here by dollars how we distribute our external
21 funding in the form of grant. The only asterisk
22 that I've got up there in the Northeast at the

1 science center there is an asterisk there because
2 that number seems small, but our research set
3 aside program, technically are zero-dollar grants,
4 but they actually encompass quite a bit of work
5 and quite a bit of value.

6 So the way we distribute, there is an
7 executive order that we try to put as much of our
8 money out externally as we can, and openly and
9 fairly as we can, so you can see that we do the
10 majority of our grants in the form of competitive
11 competitions, but where appropriate we do have
12 some non-competitive grants. We have some
13 statutorial requirements for formula allotments.
14 We'd work with institutional grants, and then at
15 the bottom you can see unsolicited in
16 sponsorships. Those are ideas that we didn't
17 solicit for that came in, we took a look at, and
18 deemed them meritorious and that's something that
19 we wanted to fund.

20 Just looking at the grant cycle, I like
21 to put this up just to kind of give people an idea
22 of the way that the budget should work.

1 Unfortunately (laughter) it doesn't work this way
2 very often, so when people are saying, you know,
3 "Why don't we get out money out the door a little
4 bit quicker," or "I see that there's an
5 appropriation; why can't we get the grants out
6 faster," it's because of the fiscal-end challenges
7 that we have here in the government and that a lot
8 of times our programs aren't getting their funding
9 until midway through the year. So if you're ever
10 wondering, certainly reach out; I'm more than
11 happy to talk with you regarding where we are in
12 the cycle compared to where we really should be,
13 and why we are getting our money out when we do.

14 And then looking at some of the program
15 areas that we do look at, I won't go over all of
16 these, but it gives you an idea of the breadth of
17 what we fund here at the National Marine Fisheries
18 Service, and the offices here in this fisheries
19 service that kind of has oversight over that, and
20 you can see our IJ or Interjurisdictional
21 Fisheries, our councils and commissions. S-K I'm
22 going to talk about in just a second. We have a

1 law to protect the research work, habitat and
2 conservation, and of course our data collection
3 which you guys have been talking about a lot
4 today. On the bottom we have kind of upcoming
5 programs where we're putting more and more
6 emphasis, so aquaculture is getting more and more
7 attention, our enforcement, and then of course our
8 international affairs.

9 And then our legislative drivers, I
10 won't go over these now except for the one
11 Saltonstall-Kennedy Act which is close to the
12 bottom there, but it gives you an idea that every
13 dollar that goes out, we have to have an authority
14 of why we're funding that work.

15 So I went through that section pretty
16 quickly because I know that most of the attention
17 was on the S-K Program and that's where a lot of
18 your questions lie. I do want to point out, you
19 know, S-K, I think is a wonderful program. It's
20 really important and we do great work through it,
21 but looking at those previous slides, S-K's about
22 \$10-million out of the \$400-million that we do

1 each year, so as we're going through this, I want
2 to have people keep that in mind and where it fits
3 into the larger grant enterprise.

4 So S-K is a unique pot of money in the
5 sense that it is not appropriated. S-K comes in
6 and is based on the S-K Act, which was signed in
7 1954, and it's based on the duties and tariffs on
8 fish products that are imported into the United
9 States. So every fish product that comes into the
10 United States has a tax or tariff that goes to the
11 Department of Agriculture. A portion of that
12 comes over to the Department of Commerce where we
13 sit, and we use that to address harvesting,
14 processing, and marketing needs.

15 So ideally if the S-K Act worked
16 perfectly, it would essentially put itself out of
17 business, because as we take this money and
18 research, add (inaudible) strength in U.S.
19 Fishing, we import less fish, there'd be less
20 duties and tariffs, and slowly we'd be
21 self-reliant completely on U.S. Fishing.

22 So here you can see the official

1 objective. Basically if you boil this down, it's
2 import less fish, get more U.S. fish marketed and
3 purchased. And so that you can say that in a lot
4 of different ways, but essentially what we're
5 trying to do is put money out for research and
6 marketing to ensure that the U.S. fishing is
7 strong and that we're importing less fish.

8 So how do we get the money? And this
9 one of the things that there's a lot of confusion
10 on, there's a lot of questions on. As I said,
11 this is non-appropriated dollars, so as the duties
12 are collected, they go into the Department of
13 Agriculture. That's ballpark \$500-million a year
14 that goes to the Department of Agriculture. The
15 S-K Act mandates that 30 percent of that goes to
16 the Department of Commerce, and specifically to us
17 at the National Marine Fisheries Service within
18 NOAA. So you can see that, again, these are our
19 -- I will talk in rough numbers, but about \$150
20 million a year depending on the economy and how
21 much imports are.

22 So that's a lot of money. Unfortunately

1 we don't get to keep it all for the S-K Program.
2 So of the \$154 million that comes in, we end up
3 with about \$10 million for the S-K Program, and
4 this is where a lot of the confusion comes in, is
5 that during the appropriation process, despite the
6 fact that we do not get appropriated dollars, our
7 lawmakers during the appropriation process do
8 what's called an ORF offset, and what that means
9 is when you read the Appropriation Act, it's going
10 to say X-number of dollars are being appropriated
11 to the National Marine Fisheries Service inside of
12 NOAA.

13 In addition, a certain amount of money
14 will be taken from the Promotion and Development
15 Account, which is that money that came over from
16 the Department of Ag, and go over to our ORF,
17 meaning that's going to supplement our
18 appropriation and those funds are going to be used
19 to fund some of our work, and you can see here
20 that we actually are directed that that 144 that
21 comes out of the P&D Account, which people kind of
22 think of as the S-K Account, gets transferred

1 over, and we're told we should use that for
2 fisheries data collection, surveys, assessments,
3 cooperative research, and interjurisdictional
4 fisheries.

5 So \$144 million comes out of that
6 account; if you do the quick math, that leaves us
7 about \$10 million for the S-K Program. So before
8 I move on, are there questions on that part,
9 because I know that a lot of times people wonder
10 why we aren't running a program of \$150 million?
11 I think we've got a question in the back.

12 MR. MOORE: Yeah, thanks, Dan. The
13 previous slideshow of the transfer from -- yeah.
14 So 513 million is what is approximately collected
15 for duties?

16 MR. NAMUR: Correct.

17 MR. MOORE: Is it in the legislation
18 that of that 513 that goes to USDA, 30 percent
19 goes to NOAA?

20 MR. NAMUR: Yes.

21 MR. MOORE: So that's part of the
22 formula?

1 MR. NAMUR: Yeah, that is actually
2 written into the S-K Act.

3 MR. MOORE: Okay, thank you.

4 MR. NAMUR: Because that 30 percent will
5 be transferred to the Department of Commerce, the
6 Secretary of Commerce moves it to NOAA for the
7 purposes as outlined in the Act.

8 CHAIR FELLER: Can I just interrupt for
9 a second? If you're asking a question, can you
10 please state your name? And that for the court
11 reporter, that was Peter Moore who raised that
12 question.

13 MR. NAMUR: Oh, thank you.

14 CHAIR FELLER: Thank you.

15 MR. MOORE: Thank you.

16 MR. NAMUR: Any other questions on that?

17 So --

18 CHAIR FELLER: Okay.

19 MR. BELLE: Sorry, Sebastian Belle here.
20 What does USDA use the rest of the money for?

21 MR. NAMUR: That's an excellent
22 question, and the truest answer is we don't track

1 that. So I don't have a good answer for you
2 unfortunately.

3 MR. BELLE: So is it appropriate for
4 this entity to ask somebody at USJ to come before
5 them and answer that question?

6 MR. NAMUR: I would leave that to
7 somebody else. You know, what comes over to us we
8 have control over. I don't know if Sam wants to
9 jump in on this, but it's not something that I
10 would say yay or nay to because I don't have -- I
11 don't think I'm the appropriate person to answer
12 that. Go ahead, Sam. Yeah.

13 MR. ROUCH: Yeah, this is Sam Rouch. I
14 don't know exactly, but everything I've always
15 been told is it was the Women's (sic), Infants,
16 and Children's (sic) Program, which is a
17 nutritional supplemental program from agriculture,
18 and that that gets the money there, and that we
19 get the rest; so the WIC Program.

20 MR. NAMUR: And we have another question
21 down front?

22 MR. SCHUMACKER: Joe Schumacker. If I

1 missed it, I'm sorry. How did the 144-million
2 offset for ORF, how does that come up with that
3 total?

4 MR. NAMUR: All right, so -- now, that's
5 an excellent question, and we did go through it
6 fairly quickly. So the ORF offset, which you can
7 see here, the 144, that's actually directed by
8 Congress during the appropriation process, so they
9 will write out the Appropriations (sic) Act, which
10 is a public law, and it will state X-number of
11 dollars are being appropriated to the Department
12 of Commerce and specifically NOAA. And that, in
13 addition, a certain amount of money will be
14 transferred from what's called the Promotion and
15 Development Account, which is where that 154 is
16 sitting, 144 will be transferred out of that
17 account and put into our ORF Account and used for
18 these purposes. And then the Delta, which is
19 about \$10 million that's left in the Promotion and
20 Development Account, we kind of reflag as the S-K
21 Program.

22 MR. SCHUMACKER: Okay, thanks.

1 MR. NAMUR: Not a problem. And I think
2 we see a red light down in the end.

3 MS. MORELAND: This is Stephanie
4 Moreland. I'd expect that \$500-million base to go
5 up substantially with the 10 and 25-percent
6 increase in tariffs for products coming from
7 China. I didn't see that elsewhere in the
8 presentation. Have you looked into that?

9 MR. NAMUR: Yes, so we do track that,
10 and that this is a variable number than that's
11 coming in through tariffs and as there's an
12 increase, that is an increase that comes across.
13 We do keep a close eye on that, although we don't
14 get too excited about the fact that we think our
15 program's going to get very, very large due to the
16 fact that the ORF offset is also variable, and
17 Congress typically watch it as that same number,
18 so if they see the number is going up, the ORF
19 offset will also go up.

20 Example, back in 2012, those numbers
21 were closer to -- the transfer was about \$130
22 million because the amount of tariffs were lower,

1 so as the tariff numbers go up quite often -- and
2 I can't speak to what the intent of Congress will
3 be this year, but quite often the ORF offset also
4 goes up which means what's left for the S-K
5 Program stays about the same. We've been
6 consistent around \$10 million for about the last
7 ten years.

8 Oh, and we've got one more, Mike?

9 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Mike Okoniewski. I
10 guess I have several questions.

11 MR. NAMUR: Okay.

12 MR. OKONIEWSKI: It seems like the
13 lion's share and then some, maybe the whole pride
14 of lion shares is going to the ORF, and there's
15 some good purpose there, but --

16 MR. NAMUR: Mm-hmm.

17 MR. OKONIEWSKI: -- having been doing
18 this, worked in this industry for a long time,
19 getting close to 50 years, and knowing how much,
20 you know, 92 percent of our seafood is now
21 imported, we consume, and we've got a real major
22 uphill battle, and not only that, you know, we can

1 argue of the tariffs all day long, but when we
2 export to other countries and that for
3 consumption, many, many times *Pandalus borealis*
4 shrimp is the prime one; we've got a 20-percent
5 tariff in the EU, except for 2,000 or 5,000 tons;
6 I forget. And we're competing against Canada that
7 has no tariff whatsoever on *borealis* from the
8 east, the Atlantic.

9 MR. NAMUR: Yeah.

10 MR. OKONIEWSKI: And yet \$10 million,
11 and I look where that 10-million dollars ends up;
12 it's very seldom does it seem to go, I'd say, from
13 what I can tell, about 20 percent where you've
14 actually fisheries' groups that are working to use
15 it for promotion and whatnot. And so because a
16 lot of it ends up at the university level.

17 MR. NAMUR: Some does, yeah, absolutely,
18 about 40 percent.

19 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, but the numbers I
20 looked at, it looks far greater than that, but I
21 didn't add them all up myself. But I guess there
22 is one area, though, and I'm looking at survey and

1 monitoring projects, why couldn't some of that be
2 dedicated towards collaborative survey work with
3 the industry? Because in some cases we're putting
4 up our own funds to supplement what the -- you
5 know, the cooperative research is great, but we
6 could sure use a little bit more of that to
7 augment some of the stock assessment information
8 that some areas where the boats can't even get
9 into the survey in several cases.

10 I mean, it seems like that is
11 disproportionate by all standards, you can imagine,
12 is to getting something back to offset the effects
13 of this seafood deficit, trade deficit we have.

14 MR. NAMUR: Okay.

15 MR. OKONIEWSKI: And, I mean, I know
16 it's not something you can wave a wand and solve,
17 but --

18 MR. NAMUR: I appreciate that.

19 (Laughter)

20 MR. OKONIEWSKI: -- it is very
21 frustrating, especially to a few of us that have
22 taken the time to submit requests and then find

1 out we've got a very poorly written document in
2 comparison to some university that's got grant
3 writers and everything else. You know, we just do
4 it in our spare time and barely make the deadline,
5 so it's pretty frustrating, honestly --

6 MR. NAMUR: So I'll address --

7 MR. OKONIEWSKI: -- to see that.

8 MR. NAMUR: -- the second portion of
9 that, kind of the selection process and percentage
10 of where it goes a little bit later, if that's all
11 right, as we move through the presentation, but I
12 certainly hear you. As far as what the use is for
13 the ORF offset, like I said, during the
14 appropriation process, these are actually
15 outlined, and then I am unfortunately not the
16 person to talk to once it goes into those accounts
17 and for those purposes exactly what it's being
18 used for. Folks that are also presenting this
19 week will be able to speak to that, so then you'll
20 have Dave Van Vorhees here for science and
21 technology and he handles a lot of our data
22 collection, those kind of things. Once it leaves

1 the P&D Account, I kind of lose a lot of control
2 over that portion of the show.

3 MR. OKONIEWSKI: So just to follow-up,
4 Stephanie pointed out a real good point here.

5 MR. NAMUR: Yeah.

6 MR. OKONIEWSKI: And so at this ratio
7 we're not going to benefit very much at all, but,
8 you know, let's just say it doubles or something,
9 we would get 20 million out of that.

10 MR. NAMUR: We would hope.

11 MR. OKONIEWSKI: And so I guess if we're
12 going to get additional funds, I would think long
13 and hard about maybe applying a different ratio to
14 this thing, than if nothing else.

15 MR. NAMUR: I appreciate that. Thanks,
16 Mike. And I think Raimundo, you had yours up and
17 you --

18 MR. ESPINOZA: I do, but I think it can
19 wait until you finish because I think it will be
20 better.

21 MR. NAMUR: No problems. And then one
22 more down at the end?

1 MR. MOORE: Sorry to prolong this. I
2 just wanted --

3 MR. NAMUR: Quite all right. I expected
4 it.

5 MR. MOORE: I just want to make sure
6 that I understand this clearly. So it is in the
7 appropriation language coming from Congress that
8 the ratio is specified between the ORF and the S&K
9 funding, is that correct? That's what you guys
10 are mandated there? You're mandated, okay.

11 MR. NAMUR: We are mandated, and it's
12 not necessarily a ratio. They give us an exact
13 dollar number. So they say X-number of dollars,
14 so in that year this is our 2017 numbers, \$144
15 million will be transferred from the P&D Account.

16 MR. MOORE: So if the amount coming to
17 National Marine Fisheries Services going to increase
18 because of these tariffs?

19 MR. NAMUR: Correct.

20 MR. MOORE: Would the agency object to
21 having the ORF amount capped and the excess above
22 that going to the S-K Program?

1 MR. NAMUR: I don't think we'd be
2 against that. We don't have a say in that, but,
3 no, we would not be against that.

4 MR. MOORE: Okay. Thank you.

5 MR. NAMUR: Oh, I can get one more.

6 MS. RALSTON: Thank you. Kellie
7 Ralston. I just had kind of a step back from that
8 kind of to the whole purpose of the program. I
9 think I had heard you say something about the
10 funds were to go to harvesting, processing, and
11 marketing needs, is that correct? And then you
12 put up a program objective slide that's a little
13 bit more general. Are these grants meant to
14 target only commercial interest or is this
15 commercial recreational, is this fisheries in
16 general; can you kind of maybe give a little bit
17 better definition for me?

18 MR. NAMUR: No, that's an excellent
19 question. So, no, absolutely it is aimed towards
20 both commercial and recreational, so it is
21 basically the fisheries universe here in the
22 United States, absolutely. And the crux of the

1 S-K Act really is promotion, development, and
2 marketing. We certainly fund research, science
3 that leads back towards that, but, yeah, the
4 research, promotion, and marketing is the crux of
5 the S-K Act. I got one --

6 MS. KALEZ: Hi. This is Donna Kalez and
7 I just had a question. I was reading the seven
8 priorities in 2017, and recreational fisheries is
9 not on there, so I was going to ask who sets the
10 priorities? I was reading that we do, or who sets
11 the priorities?

12 MR. NAMUR: So the National Marine
13 Fisheries Service and the program does set the
14 priorities and I've got a slide about how that
15 happens. In 2017, '18, and then now '19 is
16 actually open. Recreational fishing is not a
17 stand-alone priority, but it is written into all
18 of our priorities, so it is there.

19 MS. KALEZ: Okay, and then I had one
20 follow up. I was reading the grants that were
21 approved for 2014 and 2015, and there was a lot of
22 maximize fishing opportunities in jobs.

1 MR. NAMUR: Mm-hmm.

2 MS. KALEZ: And it's not in '17. It
3 kind of fell off the map; can you talk about that?

4 MR. NAMUR: Yes, so that's an
5 interesting question. So through the years, we do
6 have the flexibility to change our priorities. In
7 the '14, '15, we actually had four large themes,
8 and there were many priorities within those
9 themes, and so that particular title changed, but
10 the intent and the types of projects we were
11 seeking remained very similar. If you move on
12 from that '15 solicitation into '16 and '17 where
13 you see those seven priorities, they basically are
14 the same request that we're making. It's just
15 they bend a little bit differently, and the reason
16 we did that was during the selection process it made
17 it easier to create panels that were unique to
18 that type of work where if you have one big theme
19 that has many different priorities, it's hard to
20 get the right subject matter expertise into the
21 room for each individual priority.

22 Okay. We'll move along, and this is

1 always a really complicated portion of it, so I
2 appreciate the questions, and certainly I am happy
3 to answer these as we go along. We'll skip ahead
4 and kind of take a look at -- we've talked about
5 this portion, I think, the 144. What's left for
6 us, though, is the \$10 million dollars for the S-K
7 Program, and we run what's called a competitive
8 grant program as well as a national program. Each
9 year the majority of our funds go out through the
10 competitive solicitation. Right now, the FY19 one
11 closed last night at midnight, so that process is
12 moving forward and we're working on our selection
13 process.

14 And then each year, and it's written
15 into the S-K Act, is that the National Marine
16 Fisheries Service may run a national program to
17 fund projects that address priorities that were
18 not adequately addressed through the competitive
19 process. So after our competitive process, we
20 take a look and see if there are areas that were
21 not adequately addressed through the competitive
22 process, and we are able to, limitations being the

1 amount of funding we have, of course, put some
2 money towards national priorities that way.

3 So you can see here, again, kind of the
4 S-K competitive priorities and we're trying to do.
5 So we really are working to address the benefits
6 of U.S. fishing industry as well as recreational,
7 and we want as much community participation and
8 benefit as possible. And you can see the second
9 bullet kind of addresses what we were talking
10 about earlier, which is, yes, priorities; we do
11 have the flexibility to set our priorities each
12 year.

13 The way we set our priorities, it's a
14 quite robust process, actually. So we do a draft
15 set of priorities and they're normally based off
16 of the previous year, and from that, we send it
17 out and we ask our councils, NMFS leadership
18 around the country, and NMFS regional offices, all
19 of our science centers, and then the three
20 commissions to review our priorities and give us
21 feedback whether or not we're hitting the
22 priorities correctly for this particular year.

1 This is a national program, and so
2 through this national program we're trying to
3 address regional needs, so you'll see that our
4 priorities are somewhat general. You might not
5 see a specific type of project such as, and I'll
6 use Hawaii as an example because it's easy,
7 something that specifically says, "monk seals".
8 But you will see something that says, you know,
9 "Reduction in strikes or takes of particular
10 resources to allow our fishing industry to
11 succeed." It's a more general type of priority.

12 The selection process. So after we have
13 our priorities we put our solicitation out. We've
14 started having a preproposal process, as well, and
15 so each year now, we open it up and there are
16 two-page preproposals. The intent of that is to
17 allow applicants to submit a small two-page
18 proposal. It gives us an idea of what's coming
19 in, and it gives us the ability to reach back out
20 and let folks know whether or not they have a good
21 chance at success, whether or not they're meeting
22 our priority as well.

1 And the reason we do this is I've been
2 on the other side and doing 20-page plus all the
3 forms. It's very hard to do those applications
4 and we wanted to let people know whether or not
5 they have a good chance at winning. This is an
6 extremely competitive program, so this last year
7 we had 517 preproposals. We ended up funding 38
8 projects. So you can see that it's extremely
9 competitive. We typically get about 154
10 applications after the preproposal process. We
11 typically send about 80 to panel and we typically
12 fund about 40, so you can see that it kind of
13 keeps getting chunked down. Unfortunately that
14 number on the backend is completely reliant on the
15 amount of money we have, and so we fund about 40
16 projects because we have about \$10 million each
17 year.

18 So you can see that we go through --
19 after the preproposal process, we do -- on the
20 full proposals, there's a minimum of three
21 technical reviews on all full proposals. The top
22 of those move on to the panel process. The panel

1 process is a constituent panel, so there's no feds
2 and there's no academics that sit on that panel.
3 So the final selection is actually made by an
4 industry panel that takes a look at relevance and
5 need, so I what I normally tell our panelist is
6 that everything that came to panel is technically
7 sound. That's already been evaluated. What we
8 want you to look at as a panelist, if I was
9 talking to you as a panelist, is their relevance
10 and need, whether or not each of these areas
11 really need this work and whether or not it's
12 going to have a big benefit.

13 And from that, the final rankings come
14 and we do our final selections. You can see on
15 the left-hand side that in-between each step, we
16 stop and we talk with our partners again, and we
17 say, "Look, this is what we're looking at moving
18 forward to the next phase. Do you see that
19 there's good representation across priority types,
20 across applicant types, across research types?"
21 And then we keep moving down throughout the
22 process. So there's a lot of involvement. And

1 someone's got their card up, is there actually a
2 question, or -- that's all right.

3 MS. RALSTON: Dan?

4 MR. NAMUR: Yep. Go ahead.

5 MS. RALSTON: So out of those
6 applications, I know we talked about they're not
7 being specific recreational priorities, if you
8 will; can you talk a little bit about kind of the
9 proportion of, you know, a commercial category
10 project versus an aquaculture project versus a
11 recreational project in this process and kind of
12 how all of that plays out at the beginning and
13 then at the end, proportionally?

14 MR. NAMUR. Yeah. No, that's a great
15 question. So I don't have the numbers right in
16 front of me, but in general I can answer that
17 question. The majority are from our industry
18 side, our commercial side. We probably end up
19 with -- and Mr. Cosgrove who's in the back, he's
20 our S-K national manager, might correct me here.
21 But I would say that there's probably 15 to 20
22 percent that have a recreational component to it.

1 If you're asking about the entity types,
2 the applications that come in we typically get
3 about 40 percent from universities, and then
4 there's quite a few that come in from non-profits
5 and for-profits, so those get along together. So
6 that's what you're looking at? As the process
7 goes in each one of these bubbles, one of the
8 things that we do track is to ensure that no one
9 type is having a better win rate than any other
10 type, and so we will be doing statistical analysis
11 on all the applications that come in, and we will
12 see, and it's been consistent over the years, is
13 that if a certain type of entity comes in and is a
14 certain percentage that submit, that same
15 percentage moves throughout the process, and we
16 make sure that that's happening.

17 And we do have the ability to change the
18 ranks to make sure that we get that, but we've
19 been very fortunate that our scoring has been very
20 consistent across all of the different areas, and
21 so that if 40 percent come in as universities, 40
22 percent go on to full applications, about 40

1 percent goes on to the panel, and about 40 percent
2 is being funded. So it is quite consistent and
3 that's true across regions, entity types, research
4 types. So we do track that very closely to make
5 sure that, you know, our recreational fishing
6 experts that are doing rankings aren't harsher
7 rankers and therefore their scores are lower. We
8 do track that.

9 MS. RALSON: Can I ask a quick -- so for
10 this past cycle, can you give a breakdown, and if
11 you don't have it right this minute, that'd be
12 great --

13 MR. NAMUR: Okay.

14 MS. RALSTON: -- but, you know, sometime
15 I'd love to see those numbers and kind of what
16 that looks like.

17 MR. NAMUR: Absolutely.

18 MS. RALSTON: Thank you.

19 MR. NAMUR: And so FY18 has closed out
20 and we have funded that, so we do have all the
21 numbers and I do have all the percentages of
22 everything moving forward. Yeah, absolutely, I'm

1 more than happy to share that.

2 MR. OKONIEWSKI: You know, if I may, the
3 original intent was to offset, I guess, or make us
4 more competitive against --

5 MR. NAMUR: Yes.

6 MR. OKONIEWSKI: And so of this -- the
7 offset would be to the imports of commercial
8 products of seafood that come into this country
9 from foreign countries, is that right?

10 MR. NAMUR: So before I answer, I want
11 to make sure I'm understanding your question
12 because you're using the word "offset", and I'm
13 assuming you're not talking about the offset that
14 goes over or of that \$144 million. You're talking
15 what the intent of the actual program is what
16 we're trying to accomplish, is that correct?

17 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yes.

18 MR. NAMUR: Okay. Yes, and the intent
19 of the S-K Program is to support the U.S. fishing
20 industry and recreational fishing to make sure
21 that we are as strong as possible, yes. And
22 ideally, like I said, that would mean less imports

1 because we have more of our own products being
2 purchased and used.

3 MR. OKONIEWSKI: It would seem, though,
4 that most of the -- I don't know that recreational
5 fishing competes against foreign countries in a
6 strict sense. I mean, you either go to a foreign
7 country and fish or you fish over here, but there
8 might be some competition that way, but as far as
9 direct, one-on-one competition against foreign
10 products in their market, that seems to be pretty
11 much a commercial application, and I think the
12 idea of using these funds for recreational
13 development is a great idea. I'd just like to see
14 more money so we could do more across the board.

15 MR. NAMUR: I don't disagree. And then
16 we've got a question down here.

17 MR. MOORE: Peter Moore. Thank you,
18 Dan. That's sort of along the lines of what Mike
19 just talked about. If you go back to -- I -- you
20 don't have to do this, but one of your slides
21 showed that it was one of the intentions is to
22 maintain the working waterfronts.

1 MR. NAMUR: Mm-hmm.

2 MR. MOORE: So, you know, in my
3 experience on the East Coast now, I mean, you can
4 see North Carolina, there's hardly any working
5 waterfronts left, right, and --

6 MR. NAMUR: Yeah.

7 MR. MOORE: -- I'm not trying to sort of
8 make issues here, but I think that this program's
9 original intent was to do exactly what Mike just
10 pointed out, and I worked in it in Alaska for
11 quite a long time --

12 MR. NAMUR: Yeah.

13 MR. MOORE: -- in the eighties, and I do
14 agree that it's become a bit academic
15 here-and-there, times change, but the marketing
16 and promotion piece is something that's -- you
17 know, and my feeling is pretty unique to the
18 commercial industry. They're the ones who are
19 producing food, and that's marketing and
20 promotion. I mean, I think it'd be very
21 interesting for this group to have another
22 presentation sometime about what the original

1 intent of S-K was and who started, you know, and
2 so on, and I agree that, you know, if there's a
3 pie that's big enough to share, that's great, and
4 I think we ought to grow the pie. But I think
5 that there's a lot that we could be doing with
6 this program that we're not doing to support --
7 you know, to basically meet, you know, the terms
8 of the original legislation.

9 MR. NAMUR: You know, I think that's a
10 great point, and I'll talk to that in just a
11 second, that, you know, we've been making efforts,
12 and you'll see as the way the program's been run
13 over the last several years, is that we're
14 steering the program more and more in what I would
15 call towards the original intent again. You know,
16 we've reduced the number of priorities. The
17 priorities we have are much more focused on the
18 promotion, development, and marketing portion.

19 Our evaluation criteria are much more
20 driven on looking at how much community
21 involvement and how much benefit to the
22 communities, so absolutely, I agree with you, and

1 I think we can always continue to improve; that's
2 always our goal. But one of the things you'll see
3 is that we're already going down that road towards
4 exactly what you're talking about.

5 MR. ROUCH: Yeah, this is Sam Rouch. I
6 would just point out that as near as I could tell,
7 and I've been looking at this while we're -- this
8 legislation has been amended at least 11 times
9 since the original intent, and so while you could
10 go back and look at the original intent, the
11 legislation that exists today, which near I can
12 tell, I submitted it to Jennifer (inaudible), it
13 looks way different than it looked in the 1950s,
14 and some of the uses have broadened, some of the
15 criteria of the whole grant program is much more
16 clearly elucidated than it was then --

17 MR. NAMUR: Mm-hmm.

18 MR. ROUCH: -- so I would just -- it
19 just isn't (inaudible). Historically of what the
20 original intent was, but that's not what the
21 statute is written today is currently written as.

22 MR. NAMUR: Thank you, Sam. Yeah, all

1 right. So to that point, we use this slide. I
2 like this slide because it kind of shows the
3 different areas of fishing, grow fish, catch fish,
4 process fish, sell fish, and then use the fish or
5 eat the fish. When you're looking at the S-K
6 Program, and I hear it from you guys right now,
7 over the last 10 years or so, a lot of those
8 years, a lot of the effort was on the frontend of
9 this supply-and-demand chain that they grow and
10 they catch fish. There was a lot of work for data
11 collection, there was bycatch reduction work, so
12 there was a lot on that frontend.

13 What you'll see over the last few years,
14 and as we continue forward into FY19, and also
15 we're, believe it or not, getting ready to start
16 writing our priorities for FY20 already, is that
17 our criteria and our priorities are leaning more
18 and more towards not changing away from the catch
19 fish, grow fish, but to get more representation
20 from the sell fish, use fish, eat fish which is
21 the promotion, marketing side of things. So
22 you'll start to see that that is coming to

1 fruition in each of the next solicitations.

2 A couple of you have brought up our
3 priorities in the past, and the fact that this
4 program is flexible enough to change our
5 priorities from year to year is a great thing.
6 What you can see here is that, you know, here it's
7 not everything in the kitchen sink, but it is
8 pretty broad, and there's a lot of work that can
9 fit into the S-K Program back in 2017. Someone
10 brought up the point of in 2015 we had those four
11 and it was, you know, increase jobs. Again, that
12 was because we had themes then, and two or three
13 of these priorities actually fit within that. We
14 separated it out to make sure that we could
15 categorize our projects better.

16 You can see that there's asterisk on
17 some of these. Those are the priorities that were
18 removed from the solicitation, moving to the next
19 year, so if you move on to '18, we went down to
20 four priorities. And so we had marine
21 aquaculture, promotion, development and marketing,
22 and then in the second slot there, that's an

1 adapting and environmental changes, another
2 long-term impact. So essentially that's science
3 that leads to promotion, development, and
4 marketing, and then also territorial science was
5 in 2018.

6 Again, you can see that there is an
7 asterisk next to territorial science, because when
8 you move to FY19, we're down to three priorities
9 now. So we're really focusing in each year more
10 and more towards right now what our focus is, is
11 the promotion, development, and marketing, so our
12 number one priority. Despite the fact they're
13 numbered, we don't prioritize our priorities.
14 They all get an equal shake as they come in. But
15 we list promotion, development, and marketing,
16 marine aquaculture, and then that's a long title
17 for number three, but essentially that's science
18 that leads to promotion, development, and
19 marketing. And that's the solicitation that's --
20 was on the street up until midnight last night.
21 It closed out and we have all of our applications
22 in-house and we're starting the review process on

1 those right now.

2 Typically, Mr. Cosgrove would be giving
3 this presentation. One of the reasons he's in the
4 back is because he actually still has things
5 coming into the system right now, and we want to
6 make sure they're still moving and that we're
7 staying on track to make sure that we're making
8 our selection process.

9 Program changes for 2020, I alluded to
10 the fact that our evaluation criteria continues to
11 change, if you look back to '15, it changed in
12 '16, '17, '18, '19, and '20 we anticipate changes
13 again. Again, these aren't major sweeping
14 changes. This is not like that someone that's
15 applying, it would like a brand new program. What
16 it does is it continues to improve and tailor the
17 program to the needs of the nation. The biggest
18 change here is that if you look at the current
19 evaluation, criteria number two, it's technical
20 and scientific merit, and that's a historical
21 criteria that's been in grant programs for the
22 last 40 years.

1 For the S-K Program, we've switched that
2 to the approach and methodology to ensure that
3 reviewers weren't dinging projects that weren't of
4 the technical or scientific type, and so it allows
5 people that are reviewing the applications to look
6 at it and say, "If it's promotion and marketing,
7 there might not be any science. There might not
8 be that much technical merit to it, but the
9 approach and methodology is spot-on for what we're
10 trying to accomplish." So again, we're continuing
11 to tweak and try to improve the program to meet
12 the intent.

13 So that's kind of the S-K Program, how
14 we get to where we're going, what the numbers look
15 like. Typically there's a fair number of
16 questions. I know we're bumping up against the
17 lunch, but I'm happy to take as many questions as
18 people are willing to let their stomachs grumble.
19 So, Heidi?

20 MS. LOVETT: We will (inaudible).

21 MR. NAMUR: Yes. And so, you know,
22 Heidi's pointing out that I will be around this

1 afternoon with the subcommittee that's getting
2 together and I will join, so if there's additional
3 questions that we can't get to now, I'm happy to
4 do it then.

5 CHAIR FELLER: Okay. And you want me to
6 wrangle questions at this point?

7 MR. NAMUR: That'd be fine.

8 CHAIR FELLER: That's awesome because
9 I'll put myself first. (Laughter)

10 MR. NAMUR: That's perfect.

11 CHAIR FELLER: Can you talk a little bit
12 about what you guys do for sort of post-project
13 assessment and evaluation, like how did the
14 projects perform against the objectives set forth
15 in the Act?

16 MR. NAMUR: Yeah, absolutely, and that's
17 a good question, and it's not unique to S-K. All
18 of our grant programs have the same terms and
19 conditions, so they are required to submit every
20 six-month progress reports, which come in and our
21 technical monitors read, compare them to the
22 original scope of work and see where they are and

1 make sure that they're on pace and that we're
2 getting what we said we are paying for. We also
3 do, and, again -- funds being the limiting factor
4 here, but where possible we do site visits, go out
5 and actually see the work that's being conducted
6 and make sure that it's moving along well.

7 And then one of the things that's
8 changed, and, again, it's not unique to S-K, it's
9 for all grants, is there's a requirement for data
10 sharing plans for every grant that comes into the
11 National Marine Fisheries Service, and for that
12 matter, NOAA, and what that means is every
13 application that comes in, it tells us what
14 they're going to do and all the wonderful work
15 they're going to do and all the great outcomes,
16 but also how are they going to share that data and
17 those outcomes with the public so that becomes
18 public available. And so that's another way in
19 recent years that more and more of the information
20 is getting out to folks. Hopefully that answers
21 your question.

22 CHAIR FELLER: Rai?

1 MR. ESPINOZA: Thank you, Erika. So,
2 Dan, thanks for coming and thanks for the
3 visitation.

4 MR. NAMUR: Absolutely.

5 MR. ESPINOZA: And so first off, I mean,
6 Mike, I hear you, and for the competitiveness of
7 the Merced University which is private sector
8 especially from the fishing sector, and I really
9 think that you guys if you were to approach
10 university, it'll bring them on to help you guys
11 with the grant writing. I think they would jump
12 on it to like collaborate with you guys on some of
13 that work, and I think that you'd get some grant
14 writing for free right there as well.

15 But this is one of the things that I do
16 want to really commend you guys at S-K because
17 when I came on -- this is my first term at MAFAC
18 and this is one of the things that I really do
19 appreciate. It's one of those things that you
20 call at attention, one of the things that, well,
21 about a year and a half ago when I came onboard,
22 was that I noticed that for the past -- during the

1 first or the last 250 projects that MAFAC had
2 funded, only seven had gone to the U.S. Caribbean,
3 and so this is something that we brought to the
4 attention to see if how we -- and of course
5 territorial science, meaning the territories, were
6 a priority, and so we really wanted to make sure
7 that we can kind of get our fair share, and
8 granted not that many proposals were being
9 submitted from the Caribbean, so something was not
10 working with the system.

11 And so in the last year, and so like in
12 the past, from 2014 to 2017, only seven grants
13 were granted for the U.S. Caribbean, USVI and
14 Puerto Rico, and, however, that number went up
15 this year, so this year rec, you got four, so in
16 this last year, the U.S., Caribbean got awarded
17 more grants than the past two years combined. And
18 it's something in the past years, it's kind of as
19 -- you know, up quite a bit, so it's something
20 that (inaudible)), of course, is just for the
21 region. It's very exciting that to finally really
22 be represented in the S-K Program, and, again. So

1 it's one of those things that your concerns,
2 again, it makes me happy to be part of MAFAC
3 because a lot of folks on the ground are getting
4 their voices heard through us, here, and, you
5 know, NOAA is taking effective measures to make
6 sure that they address anything, so I don't --
7 either more folks submitted, word got out more
8 about S-K, and so the other thing -- and so, yes,
9 so thank you very much for listening to the
10 constituents, of course.

11 MR. NAMUR: Absolutely.

12 MR. ESPINOZA: And then so the other
13 thing is I do -- one other things that I do see of
14 S-K from where the funds are coming from and how
15 they're being used and a lot of concerns that Mike
16 raised about the tariffs and the competition with
17 Canada and how this is really to aid the fisheries
18 sector, recreational and commercial, is seeing how
19 they work with your other grants program, for
20 example, the Cooperative Research which has a
21 component, specifically, that integrates fishermen
22 into it, and that's something, you know, that I

1 keep, you know, promoting everywhere, every place
2 I can, that including the fisheries sector,
3 formally, into the grant process, into the
4 proposal writing and not just being part of the
5 folks that we ask for information and, of course,
6 that we'll be put into the grants and then we
7 charge a salary, but making sure that we're able
8 to include fishery sector, being recreational or
9 commercial, mostly commercial, of course, because
10 that's where I'm coming from as well with my
11 collaborations mainly is to be equative, to have
12 that -- having representative on the grant as
13 well, not only for the intellectual part, but also
14 for the economic aspects.

15 Most folks on grants are charging
16 salaries. They are charging that, but we don't
17 see that with the collaborations that are included
18 for the commercial sector. So you see a lot of
19 research going on, a lot of universities are
20 getting funding, you know, again, for the salaries
21 and then for equipment and there is collaborations
22 with the commercial sector, however we don't see

1 that distribution happening equally.

2 So that's one of the things that CRP,
3 for example, does address, and so I think maybe
4 that's something to consider in the future because
5 that's again one of the things that I hear from
6 Mike is that, you know, private sector can
7 compete. And so when you see private sector,
8 that's also really interesting because, for
9 example, you might see private sector getting
10 grants on S-K, but they might be private sector
11 research institutions, so they're not necessarily
12 a private sector fisheries groups. So even then
13 it could be excused because you might be thinking
14 your leveling the playing field, but private
15 sector, for example, one of the grants for Puerto
16 Rico is electronic -- it's eDNA to find new
17 fishing aggregations which is really amazing
18 research, however, you know, we don't see how that
19 necessarily is going to be related.

20 You ask the fishermen they'll tell you
21 where the fishing aggregations are. (Laughter)
22 So it is one of those things that -- if they like

1 you, right? So, I mean, it's one of those things
2 that we do see it's amazing research coming
3 through and it's really innovative the things that
4 they are doing, but if we were to integrate or try
5 that for the integrate industry, I think we could
6 get a lot more cost-effective information as well.
7 But thanks a lot for the great response, and,
8 again, your great work.

9 MR. NAMUR: No, I appreciate those
10 comments Raimundo, and I think that -- and because
11 of the time limitation, I don't get into all the
12 weeds of the S-K Program, but we are starting to
13 address that. Now, we don't have -- like CRP has
14 a requirement to pair up. Bycatch reduction has a
15 collaboration component as well. We don't have
16 that mandatory collaboration, but we do have, in
17 the preproposal phase, which is kind of that your
18 foot in the door, two of the four criteria address
19 the benefit to the community and the involvement
20 of the community, so therefore we're funneling
21 each year, and, again, if you look back further
22 you're not going to see that, but each year you'll

1 see that more and more involvement and more and
2 more working with the communities with the
3 fishermen, absolutely.

4 And then to address -- and not to debunk
5 it, per se, but to address the,
6 what-we-can't-compete-with argument, you know, we
7 do look at that really closely, so there's kind of
8 two arguments that typically happen: One is,
9 pretty much any region that's not the northeast
10 saying we can't compete with the big northeast
11 universities and everything going on up there.

12 The second is: The little guys can't
13 compete with the universities in general, is we do
14 look at that, and at least right now what we're
15 seeing is it's mostly a volume issue, that the win
16 rates actually for the universities, especially
17 when they get to panel, is actually the lowest of
18 any of our entity types.

19 So that the other types of entities are
20 actually winning at a better rate, but as you
21 point out, if you only submit seven applications,
22 it's hard to win ten, so it becomes a volume issue

1 to a certain extent. We still are trying in every
2 way possible to encourage more and more
3 applications. We're doing more and more outreach.
4 In the last year I've done several webinars
5 nationwide, but I also have done grant-writing
6 workshops out in the islands in the Pacific.

7 We're sending folks down to the
8 Caribbean to do grant-writing workshops there. I
9 think I did seven or eight radio spots talking
10 about S-K, trying to encourage, and these aren't
11 on just regular radio stations. Most of them are
12 on like actual fisheries industry stations saying,
13 "We really want folks to apply," so we really are
14 trying to increase our visibility and the number
15 of applications coming in. So hopefully that
16 addresses both points there.

17 CHAIR FELLER: So on my list, I've got
18 Joe, Roger, Stephanie, and then Mike, and then
19 we're going to lunch. So, Joe?

20 MR. SCHUMACKER: Thanks, Madam Chair,
21 Joe Schumacker. Thanks. The worry that was
22 bouncing around my head was addressed with your

1 last slide, and that was the, how the Technical
2 Review Panel was seeing marketing type proposals
3 and things of that nature.

4 MR. NAMUR: Mm-hmm.

5 MR. SCHUMACKER: And it sounds like
6 you're trying to address them; can you talk just a
7 little bit more about how you're trying to address
8 that?

9 MR. NAMUR: Yes, so I'll address that in
10 two ways. One, so the technical review phase is
11 three independent subject-matter experts that
12 review and we try to find the best subject-matter
13 experts for each individual application. We get
14 three, their scores are average, that's how things
15 move along through the initial review phase. The
16 top proposals then move onto panel.

17 So in that technical review phase these
18 criteria have been altered and that's what I was
19 addressing there, is that we're trying to address
20 the fact that we want to ensure the approach in
21 methodologies is what's being looked at and not
22 just the scientific merit because it may not be a

1 scientific application. But I do want to point
2 out that we seek and get the subject-matter
3 experts that are specific to each individual
4 application, so it's not like there's a big pool
5 of reviewers and you might get someone that's
6 really not very good at marketing. We go out and
7 we find the best reviewers that we can for each
8 individual application.

9 The same thing happens at panel. It is
10 not one big panel. We actually hold an individual
11 panel per priority so that we don't have, you
12 know, an aquaculture guy, may be brilliant, but he
13 probably doesn't know a lot about marketing. So
14 therefore the aquaculture panel sits, and then
15 when we're done with those, we dismiss them, and
16 we have a different panel for our promotion,
17 development, and marketing; we bring in the
18 experts for that. We release them. So for each
19 panel we have a different group of people to
20 ensure we have the best folks reviewing each of
21 those types of applications. So hopefully that --

22 MR. SCHUMACKER: That addresses it.

1 MR. NAMUR: -- addresses it.

2 CHAIR FELLER: Roger?

3 MR. BERKOWITZ: Good. Roger Berkowitz.

4 Dan, thank you. Just out of curiosity, can you
5 come up with any examples where grants have gone
6 out for marketing, specifically over the last
7 couple of years?

8 MR. NAMUR: Absolutely. We've got a
9 couple of really good examples right now. There
10 was actually just an article in the Boston Globe
11 with regards to green crab, that there's a S-K
12 funded research program that's trying to market
13 the invasive green crab and get a new market which
14 is really great. Another example is, there was a
15 research project that was working on spiny dogfish
16 and whether or not that those would market better
17 if they weren't called something with the word
18 "dog" in them. (Laughter) So that actually was
19 funded and they're using the model of choi and sea
20 bass as kind of the jump-off point for that, that
21 when they changed the name that it became more
22 marketable. So those are two real quick ones. We

1 can certainly get into more if you'd like, but
2 that's two that I can do right off the top of my
3 head.

4 MR. BERKOWITZ: Thank you.

5 MS. MORELAND: This is Stephanie
6 Moreland. Before breaking this conversation off
7 into the subcommittee, I just want to bring to
8 people's attention I have a lot of experience with
9 this program, applying with others as well as
10 participating in projects that have been rewarded,
11 and in my view this is very broken, in part
12 because of the review selection process, the
13 entities that are providing input on priorities.
14 The Regional Councils do a great job of setting
15 research priorities, great job all those entities
16 weighing in on priorities for the ORF side of the
17 equation, but not a lot of experience in time
18 bandwidth to be talking about marketing and
19 product development promotion.

20 The largest fishery in the U.S., the
21 Alaska Pollock Fishery, faces a 32-percent tariff
22 to access the market in China, today. We are

1 competing in the U.S. against Russian Pollock
2 reprocessed in China, coming into the U.S. with
3 zero tariff, and it will remain zero tariff on
4 January 1 while everything else goes to 25
5 percent.

6 This is a great example of where this
7 program should be effective. We have no intent to
8 submit under this program to help that situation
9 because of the cap and because of our experience
10 in applying with projects. Instead, I spent the
11 last month refining our collaboration support for
12 a project on seaweed.

13 MR. NAMUR: Thank you for those
14 comments, and certainly we will take them to
15 heart. Thank you.

16 CHAIR FELLER: Mike, you want to bring
17 us home, or at least to lunch?

18 MR. OCONIEWSKI: Yeah. Number one is
19 that the processors are actually, on the
20 commercial side, much more tip of the spear going
21 into the market whereas the fishermen are much
22 more the spear on the harvest side, but we have to

1 coexist and we've got to do it against a singular
2 supply chain that comes out of most of these
3 foreign countries. Stephanie's remarks are
4 spot-on.

5 I mean, this is the kind of stuff I hear
6 from our sales guys constantly. And it is really
7 frustrating, maybe the intents have changed and
8 the priorities have changed, but nonetheless,
9 it's, I think, remains the fishing industry that
10 needs the help and I'd love to see some of it go
11 to recreational as well, but I think there's a
12 huge potential here, and if you hear about some of
13 the priorities of making our seafood number one,
14 making it great again, so-to-speak, this could be
15 an opportunity. So I'll leave it at that and see
16 if we can get everybody out of here to lunch.

17 MR. NAMUR: I know; I appreciate that,
18 Mike. Thank you for the comments.

19 CHAIR FELLER: Thanks, you guys. Well,
20 I'll just let you know that with those comments,
21 you guys are in luck because this afternoon at
22 2:45 when the subcommittees meet, the Strategic

1 Planning Budget and Program Management, is that
2 the name of my subcommittee, will be meeting --

3 SPEAKER: I think that's it.

4 CHAIR FELLER: -- yeah. And we will be
5 (laughter) talking about this and, Dan, will you
6 or Cliff be in the room with us?

7 MR. NAMUR: Yeah, I'll attend.

8 CHAIR FELLER: And what we'll be doing
9 at that meeting is kind of talking and
10 brainstorming a little bit about, you know, what
11 kinds of things the subcommittee might work on, so
12 please come to that if you would like to talk
13 about this more.

14 MS. LUKENS: Okay. Thank you, everyone,
15 for this morning. We're going to break now for
16 lunch and reconvene at 1:30. I'm asking you all
17 to try to get to the lobby because you have to go
18 through security, yet again, and be escorted back
19 up here. Try to get there around 1:15 so you have
20 time to get up to the room so we can start at
21 1:30. You will have the names and -- you'll have
22 the numbers to call if you need an escort if

1 they're not there waiting for you. Heidi, I
2 believe, has a list of nearby restaurants, and it
3 looks like we might have a break in the rain so
4 you won't get swamped. And so back here about
5 1:15 so we can start at 1:30. Robert, did you
6 have a question?

7 MR. JONES: Just I assume that it's okay
8 for us to leave our stuff here (inaudible).

9 MS. LUKENS: Yes, you leave your
10 valuables here and we'll have someone in the room.
11 Thank you.

12 (Recess)

13 CHAIR FELLER: Matthew, would she please
14 take your seats? Everyone is -- nothing should be
15 --

16 MS. LOVETT: Your speaker group is
17 together, ma'am. Thank you.

18 CHAIR FELLER: Great. Thank you. So
19 can you hear me okay? The next presentation is on
20 the Columbia Basin Partnership Taskforce and we're
21 going to hear from a bunch of folks, at least some
22 folks I think that we met with when we were in

1 Portland at the last meeting. So what I'd like to
2 do just to get this started because all of our
3 speakers are going to be on the phone and then
4 Heidi is going to be on point for getting through
5 the slides. Hey folks on the phone, I'm just
6 going to list who's on there. And so after I say
7 your name, can you just sing out, say hi or
8 something so that people can get a basic voice
9 identification since we can't see any of you. So
10 we've got Barry Thom, who the regional
11 administrator for the west coast.

12 MR. THOM: Good afternoon everybody.

13 CHAIR FELLER: Hi Barry. We've got
14 Heath Heikkila with the Coastal Conservation
15 Association for Civic Northwest Fisheries.

16 MR. THOM: Good afternoon, wish I was
17 there in DC with you on election day, but maybe
18 not so much.

19 CHAIR FELLER: Jennifer Andrews with the
20 Northwest Power and Conservation Council.

21 MS. ANDREWS: Good afternoon. I'd like
22 you to know that I'm sitting in six inches of new

1 snow here in Montana, so it's a good day for us.

2 CHAIR FELLER: Don't rub it in. And
3 Katherine Cheney with the West Coast Region for
4 NIMS.

5 MS. CHENEY: Yes. Good morning.

6 CHAIR FELLER: Great. Thank you, guys.
7 I'll turn it over to you. Oh, one quick thing.
8 We'll have time for questions at the other end of
9 it. Just -- as you're thinking about your
10 questions maybe think about who you want to direct
11 them to because again, the speakers can't see you,
12 so if you want to ask Barry a question, say it's
13 for Barry. If it's just a general question for
14 the panel, you might just indicate that to make it
15 easier on them. All right, take it away guys.

16 MS. CHENEY: Oh, hold on one second.

17 CHAIR FELLER: Oh wait, Heidi, hang on.

18 MS. ANDERS: And also a Heidi has given
19 you some handouts that they'll be referring to
20 during the presentation on the table in front of
21 you.

22 CHAIR FELLER: Great.

1 MR. THOM: All right. So I think I'm
2 kicking this off. This is Barry, so good
3 afternoon everybody and I can see the Webex slides
4 up on my screen and so we'll walk you through
5 there. I think Heidi is going to be turning the
6 pages so to speak as we walked through this. So I
7 know we updated MAFAC several months ago at the
8 beginning of the summer on the Columbia Basin
9 Partnership Taskforce. Since that time, there's
10 been a lot of work. And so, I want to -- just
11 wanted to remind folks in terms of the products
12 about -- that we are providing are putting
13 together as part of the Columbia Basin Partnership
14 Taskforce, so that first slide two you're looking
15 at we'll talk a little bit about the actual
16 recommendations report, but a big component of
17 that has been the initial building of the guiding
18 principles, vision and some of the qualitative
19 goals, more of the written components of the
20 project. And then a lot of work went into
21 developing a quantitative goals for salmon and
22 steelhead across the basin with some broader

1 recommendations on how to move forward as we go
2 into this next -- the second phase of the process.
3 A real focus, like I said, on this as qualitative
4 and quantitative goals, I think that's really the
5 meat of the discussion moving forward.

6 Moving on to slide three. Like I said,
7 there's been a lot of activity since June. Over
8 the summer, the Taskforce, the taskforce members
9 were out actively sharing those products with
10 their communities and constituencies. They talked
11 with the different boards that they represent. I
12 made presentations at different conferences,
13 organized some local public meetings where they
14 could share this information and we checked in
15 with a group in mid-August and a lot of that
16 feedback that we got from the group in terms of
17 feedback on the actual draft recommendations
18 moving forward upon the partnership taskforce
19 website, if people are interested in that detail
20 feedback. In general, the feedback was very
21 positive about the overall effort and the level of
22 collaboration. We've also gotten some specific

1 questions about the goals and some of the
2 discussion on some of the particular geographies
3 which I'll hit on just a little bit as we go
4 through this.

5 We had an official taskforce meeting in
6 early October to try to really get to a
7 provisional agreement moving forward. Most of
8 that discussion centered around the quantitative
9 goals. A couple of things that came up that were,
10 I think, a big part of that discussion about how
11 we characterize the goals. So when I tend to say
12 quantitative goals right now, most of that focuses
13 on natural production, quantitative goals for the
14 basin. He's just going to elaborate a little bit
15 on how we characterize the goals related to both
16 hatcheries and harvest and a little bit of
17 modification there that we've made moving forward.
18 And then another big issue has been the goals
19 related to what we call it, blocked areas above
20 impassable dams, such as Hells Canyon in Idaho or
21 Chief Joseph Dam in northwest Washington. And so
22 big discussion on those goals because they're

1 particularly important for those upper basin
2 tribes in terms of restoring access to salmon in
3 those historical areas.

4 So the work has continued. We've been
5 continuing to make some small refinements,
6 continuing to fill in some gaps in the
7 quantitative goals spreadsheets and we'll be
8 meeting again in mid-November through Webex across
9 the group to continue to reach agreement and pull
10 together a both recommendations and finalization
11 of the recommendations report, which I think we're
12 going to talk about. I think Jennifer's probably
13 going to cover that as we get to the latter part
14 of this presentation.

15 And then lastly, I think that the last
16 piece has been having a discussion about how we're
17 going to continue this work in the next phase. I
18 think if you remember from the last MAFAC meeting,
19 we got permission to extend the taskforce up to
20 another two years and so we've been trying to put
21 some sideboards and frame up what we might be
22 talking about as we go into that, what we call the

1 second phase of the process moving forward.

2 Jumping to slide four and just a little
3 bit more discussion about the quantitative goals
4 and how to characterize those goals. And I think
5 we covered a little bit of this in the last MAFAC
6 meeting that right now, and really this November
7 focus of the taskforce is reaching agreement on
8 provisional goals -- a provisional quantitative
9 goals and the recommendations report moving
10 forward. So as you go through these goals, one of
11 the pieces we recognize is that the goals haven't
12 been tested in terms of are they actually
13 practical, implementable on the ground. And so,
14 there's definitely some folks that want to
15 continue to work on that part of the process to
16 understand how those goals interrelated to each
17 other across the different basins and what's this
18 sort of magnitude of actions required to get to
19 those goals in each of the different areas.

20 So that's where we tend to think about
21 these as provisional goals. They're good enough
22 to move into the next phase of the process, but

1 that's really the next phase of the process is
2 going to further refine and develop those goals
3 moving forward. And again, I think another piece
4 of this as Rich will talk a little bit about is
5 the harvest and hatchery pieces where we're
6 characterizing definitely. We weren't actually
7 able to reach harvest and hatchery goals per se in
8 this piece, but those will be in as part of the
9 process in phase two for what levels of hatchery
10 production can fill in gaps or what levels of
11 harvest might be possible as we move into the
12 future.

13 Jumping onto slide five. So the last
14 piece that I'm going to cover it before turning it
15 over to Heath is the question came up -- it's come
16 up regularly. It came up again at the last
17 meeting of the partnership and it's a question
18 about how are these goals going to be used. And I
19 think one of the pieces we've faced with is in
20 order for this process to move forward and for
21 people to sort of buy in and be able to implement
22 these goals over time, people have to sort of step

1 out of the paradigm we've been working in from an
2 endangered species act management process into
3 more of -- more of what you might think about
4 folks on MAFAC of a more of a Magnusson Fisheries
5 Management Type Paradigm moving forward. And so
6 there's these goals become really goals for all of
7 the entities in the region to implement. And just
8 the recognition that if we achieve these goals,
9 the low level goals, our ESA(d) listing. So once
10 we achieved that ESA(d) listing for 13 of the 24
11 stocks in the basin that are listed, that no
12 fishery doesn't have that regulatory authority
13 under the Endangered Species Act anymore.

14 And so that's really -- it really
15 changes this into a -- the long-term management,
16 like I said, what you would think of more under
17 the Magnuson Act of actually managing these stocks
18 sustainably with the co-managers to states and
19 tribes and the stakeholders in the basin actually
20 moving forward in a sustainable way. And so it
21 really requires everybody to step up. And that is
22 the intent of the process is to get actually

1 larger buy-in across the landscape for forgetting
2 to share success on salmon and steelhead. And so
3 I think that is a -- it's a recognition. I think
4 people are starting to realize that this is a
5 different way of thinking about things and I think
6 are starting to buy into that as you move forward.

7 So with that, I'm going to turn it over
8 to Heath who is going to talk a little bit about
9 -- a little bit more about that quantitative goals
10 moving forward.

11 MR. HEIKKILA: Okay. Yeah. Thank you
12 Barry and thanks for the opportunity to join in
13 this report. You have a slide in front of you
14 that I think is a pretty good descriptor of -- I
15 got to give you a scale idea of what we've been
16 talking about and focusing on, I'd say. And a
17 Barry, I think, covered the fact that we've got 13
18 ESA listed stocks of salmon and steelhead in the
19 Columbia River Basin. Those would be down on that
20 lower end of this continuum that you see. And I
21 think that's where a lot of the debate has kind of
22 been stuck for years in the northwest with

1 litigation and other things that a lot of you are
2 aware of. And I think, as Barry mentioned, and
3 that's where NOAA's regulatory framework comes
4 into place with those ESA listed stocks, but with
5 the partnership has really been focused on this
6 green area above that ESA recovery line.

7 And what is -- what are our goals when
8 we get into that kind of healthy and harvestable
9 range there on the continuum? That would be above
10 the ESA listings. It would be where you could
11 start to think about a more options in terms of
12 harvest and other things that we want to be able
13 to accomplish as a region that maybe we're not
14 able to right now because of ESA listings. And
15 I'll tell you the complicating nature a lot of our
16 fisheries and management is a lot of times there
17 are stocks that aren't your target stock, maybe
18 that you're fishing for, but you've got a
19 non-target stock that is co-mingled with these
20 other stocks that can limit a recovery. So it
21 really is about all -- a number of these stocks
22 and doing it holistically, which is, I think the

1 kind of new idea here that's really encouraging.

2 So figuring out what those goals look
3 like in that green I think is -- been a fantastic
4 exercise for the group. I think if you go up to
5 the blue here in terms of pristine, I think that
6 the group has -- we've all -- we all understand
7 that the habitat isn't pristine and it's not going
8 to be pristine, pre-human settlement, but that we
9 can do a lot in this green area moving up towards
10 blue and in terms of setting goals and growing
11 natural production. So that's really the focus.
12 I think Barry talked about this kind of -- the
13 quantitative goals and what we were doing, trying
14 to set some goals related to a natural abundance
15 essentially. And so what you actually have an
16 example of a handout with some charts and graphs
17 that you can look at, but it'll kind of give you
18 an idea of what the group has done on essentially
19 stocks throughout the Columbia river basin in
20 terms of looking at what are our occurrence
21 natural production levels because that really
22 drives everything. Looking at what are our

1 hatchery production levels right now and what have
2 been -- what's been harvests on some of these
3 stocks. And the natural production goals, as I
4 mentioned, kind of drives everything. So we've
5 set those goals -- those broad sense goals for
6 natural production. And as Barry mentioned, while
7 we haven't set goals necessarily for hatchery
8 production levels, partly because some of that's
9 driven by mitigation for dams or tribal treaty
10 fishing rights, things like that, we do know they
11 interrelate very closely with the natural
12 production because if you have a stronger natural
13 production, you actually then -- it might not make
14 sense, you can actually have increased hatchery
15 production many instances, or if we increase our
16 hatchery -- or we increased our natural
17 production, we can actually decrease our hatchery
18 production too. So it provides you a lot of
19 options there moving forward for harvest and for
20 -- in creating opportunity throughout the basin.

21 And so that has been our focus. If you
22 look at the chart, you'll get an idea again of

1 some estimates on terms of what some current
2 harvest levels have been on those stocks and what
3 maybe you can see in terms of harvest with these
4 broad sense goals if we were able to accomplish
5 them. So they are provisional quantitative goals
6 right now, but I think they're very useful for the
7 region as it looks to set some goals beyond that
8 ESA listed world that we're in. And I think we
9 can probably move on to slide eight.

10 And then as I mentioned, so you've got
11 some potential harvest levels under these various
12 scenarios and we know that with the healthy
13 natural production stocks, we can support higher
14 harvest rates for these stocks, what they can
15 handle in terms of harvest rates can differ based
16 on species. So a steelhead can actually -- can't
17 quite support the level of harvest that Chinook
18 can -- Chinook salmon. So those kinds of things
19 are factors. Factors are embedded in these
20 estimates, which I think is also very helpful in
21 terms of giving, for my constituency, recreational
22 anglers an idea of maybe what the world would look

1 like in the future in terms of fishing opportunity
2 and in terms of harvest and as you probably know
3 in the Columbia River Basin, fishing is a huge
4 economic driver, certainly with a recreational
5 fisheries. We do have commercial fisheries as
6 well, but recreational fisheries throughout the
7 Columbia River Basin, which is an economic driver
8 for rural communities and industries across the
9 northwest. So that, that's kind of, I think, a
10 good vision of where we're going. And in terms of
11 looking forward, Barry kind referenced this
12 discussion about what does the future look like in
13 terms of maybe opening up some access to habitat
14 that hasn't been open in the past and that is
15 really, I think, factored into some of these
16 numbers as well, is what would it look like if you
17 could have access for salmon above Chief Joe; what
18 would it do for your natural production levels;
19 and, what would it mean in terms of harvest and
20 most importantly natural abundance in terms of the
21 conservation of these stocks? So I think that is
22 kind of where I am at on my side of things and I'm

1 going to transition to a Jennifer who's going to
2 go next.

3 MS. ANDERS: Thank you, Heath and thank
4 you for the invitation to speak today. It's been
5 a real honor and pleasure to work with this group
6 and for me being from Montana, an opportunity to
7 learn a lot about some things I didn't know about
8 before I began this work. My objective here today
9 is to talk a little bit about the qualitative
10 goals that are associated with the quantitative
11 goals that Heath just talked about.

12 We have four categories of qualitative
13 goals. And the first three, nearer the
14 quantitative goals that Heath mentioned. The
15 first being natural production and this is again,
16 the main goal of restoring salmon and steelhead in
17 the basin to healthy and harvestable fishable
18 levels. This is mostly aimed at ESA(d) listing,
19 broad sense recovery and then over time rebuilding
20 the spacial distribution and run timing of these
21 species. The goals are expressed in temporal
22 terms, so we have 25-year goals, 50-year goals and

1 a hundred-year goals. So it's quite ambitious all
2 around.

3 Goal two, would be to provide diverse,
4 productive and dependable tribal and non-tribal
5 harvest and fishing opportunities for Columbia
6 Basin Salmon and steelhead in both (inaudible) and
7 marine waters. And again, these are expressed in
8 temporal goals between 25 and 100 years.

9 Goal three has to do with harvest and
10 fisheries, and the goal is to produce hatchery
11 salmon and steelhead to support conservation,
12 mitigate for lost natural production and support
13 fisheries in a manner that strategically aligns
14 hatchery production with natural production
15 recovery goals and is consistent with best
16 available science. So these are the three main
17 goals that are matched with our quantitative
18 goals. We added a fourth and this is a very
19 important aspect of the qualitative goals sphere.
20 This is a social, cultural, economic, and
21 ecological considerations that we would like to
22 see taken into account when people involved with

1 the management of these species make decisions.
2 So (inaudible) is basically expressed as making
3 decisions within a broader context that reflects
4 and considers effects to the full range of social,
5 cultural, economic, and ecosystem values and
6 diversity in the basin.

7 The qualitative goals, they serve as
8 guidance for our efforts over the next hundred
9 years as I mentioned. And the quantitative goals
10 that Heath talked about reflect the ways that we
11 can measure if we have in fact achieved our
12 qualitative goals. Overall, they represent very
13 important values that need to be realized
14 throughout the basin in order that our efforts can
15 be considered successful. And while each of these
16 goals stand by themselves, it doesn't mean that
17 they are mutually exclusive. Our success will
18 depend on the ability of the region to balance all
19 of these goals and work towards them together
20 simultaneously.

21 I mentioned the 25, 50 and hundred-year
22 timeframes and while the work of the taskforce

1 looks ahead to envision these runs a hundred years
2 from now, we also recognize that there's an urgent
3 opportunity to act at the present time. The
4 taskforce has had a lot of discussion about the
5 need to both look out into the future to plan for
6 the long haul while at the same time finding ways
7 to encourage actions that are needed at the
8 present moment, both for humans and the other
9 species of animals that depend on these fish for
10 survival.

11 You can transition me to slide 10.
12 Barry made mention of the recommendations report.
13 I think you have a copy of the outline before you.
14 You can see that the first several sections
15 provide a context for these schools and describe
16 the experience of our taskforce members. In
17 addition, the recommendations will include
18 two-page summaries of the quantitative goals that
19 he's talked about and other relevant information
20 for each of the 24 stocks. All of the details
21 will be contained in appendices. So we're hoping
22 that the bulk of the document is a good tight,

1 solid summary review and for those who are more
2 technically inclined, they can dive in deep in the
3 appendices. We hope that the report is final and
4 ready to go out in sometime in -- towards the end
5 of January. And that concludes my presentation.
6 I'm happy to answer questions at the end. Thank
7 you very much.

8 MR. THOM: All right, thanks Jennifer.
9 And this is Barry, just sort of wrapping up in
10 terms of next steps piece of it. I'm just going
11 over the calendar. So, like I mentioned earlier,
12 we will be meeting with the taskforce group in
13 November to reach a final agreement on the goals
14 themselves and get final edits on the
15 recommendations document moving forward and then
16 we'll be meeting at the end of January 2019,
17 hopefully more of a ceremonial meeting to finalize
18 everything and make sure that the report is
19 sufficient to transfer and transmit to you folks
20 that MAFAC for your review. And I think that's
21 going to be scheduled to as one of the taskforce
22 meetings for in either late February or early

1 March of next year with the hope that it makes
2 that can then transmit that finalized report to
3 NOAA Fisheries leadership. So the -- I think that
4 sort of wraps up in terms of the schedule for the
5 actual recommendations report coming out of phase
6 two and then at the same time where, like I said,
7 we're framing up sort of the pieces of work that
8 we would carry forward in our phase two work, the
9 next phase of work and we'll be working through
10 that in early spring and are hoping to complete a
11 lot of that work at least in the initial timeframe
12 to get that done through 2019 in terms of a focus
13 on scenarios that can be taken forward for
14 analysis of different ways of achieving the goals
15 across the landscape and under a variety of
16 different scenarios that people might bring
17 forward as part of the group.

18 So with that I'd be -- I think we'd all
19 be happy to answer any questions you may have on
20 the goals themselves or the recommendations report
21 or any other process moving forward?

22 CHAIR FELLER: Great. Thanks, y'all.

1 Joe, you look like you have a question even before
2 you got that up.

3 (Laughter)

4 MR. SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Madam Chair.
5 Thank you all for the report. This is Joe
6 Schumacher. Sounds like you're making great
7 headway. I'm always interested in the -- I'll
8 call it, for lack of a better term, the food fight
9 that occurs whenever surplus fisher come into the
10 picture. Sounds like you've got some good
11 discussion on that matter going on now and maybe
12 some folks have come to a different understanding,
13 so how those surplus fish can be worked with and
14 allocated appropriately. One of the big ones, of
15 course, we've been hearing about recently, has
16 been the orcas and I'm sure that's coming to your
17 conversation down there as well. Maybe you could
18 elaborate a little bit more about what kind of
19 understanding you're getting from folks now on
20 what they want to do with stocks that are doing
21 well and those that may maybe recovered in the
22 future.

1 MR. THOM: Thanks Joe. Thanks, Madam
2 Chair. This is Barry. I'll take a stab at that,
3 it's been a couple of different perspectives on
4 the orca issue that has come up, especially even
5 more recently in the discussions of the taskforce
6 of how the goals established by the taskforce
7 would interrelate with the goals and needs for the
8 endangered southern resident killer whales up in
9 Puget Sound. A couple of things. One is and it
10 gets recognized as you go through this that if we
11 were to actually achieve these goals and get
12 beyond these -- the low levels and into that
13 moderate and high levels of that, that would do a
14 great deal of improving overall prey availability
15 for southern residents with a specific recognition
16 that, that species like southern residents are
17 recognized as part of the ecological qualitative
18 goal considerations as we move forward.

19 So I think by moving into a mode,
20 especially as you look at these goals, are really
21 an escapement-based management where you're
22 maintaining minimum level of escapement for

1 natural production in the system; that it's going
2 to provide an abundant amount of fish both for the
3 ecosystem considerations as well as for commercial
4 recreational harvest in the system.

5 MR. HEIKKILA: Yeah, Barry, this is
6 Heath. I might just add on a piece in response to
7 another question or comment that was there. And
8 we have avoided discussions of like allocation or
9 anything like that between commercial,
10 recreational, and obviously, the tribal side of
11 things. It's that pretty clear with a treaty
12 rights, but we have generally avoided those
13 conversations because at this point we're living
14 in a system and the Columbia River that is
15 basically managed on weak stock management, which
16 means we're constrained by whatever weak stressed
17 stock is present in the various seasons and
18 they're essentially is one in each season. An ESA
19 listed stock and so getting into discussions about
20 trying to figure out what harvest would mean two
21 different sectors without first addressing that
22 figuring how we get above weak stock management

1 really wasn't an area we spent time, but we did.
2 I think there was broad agreement that we want to
3 be coming from a place of abundance rather than
4 scarcity or weak stock management. So, maybe that
5 helps with that question.

6 MR. SCHUMACHER: It does. Thank you.

7 CHAIR FELLER: Randy.

8 MR. FISHER: It's this thing again.

9 Barry, it's Randy Fisher. Has there been
10 discussions yet about how to pay for some of this
11 stuff?

12 MR. THOM: Thanks, Randy. I think I
13 heard the question and do you mean pay for the
14 actual actions that would be needed to achieve the
15 goals?

16 MR. FISHER: Yes. I mean I'm assuming
17 that Bonneville is at the table or somebody else
18 must be at the table and then we'll have to figure
19 out how to fund some of these activities,
20 including increased hat trick production, et
21 cetera.

22 MR. THOM: Yeah, so within the current

1 taskforce, we have not talked about both the
2 actual actions that would need to be taken to
3 achieve the goals or the funding associated with
4 taking those actions recognizing it some may take
5 funding and some may not. And that is really, I
6 think, the frame-up for the stage two discussion
7 is to actually put out on the table what actions
8 people think could or should be taken so that we
9 can analyze the potential benefits of those
10 actions. And then the second piece of that is,
11 and what's the cost associated both either the
12 cost of someone not being able to do something or
13 the cost of actually funding habitat restoration
14 or proactive actions on the landscape. That's
15 really the phase two piece.

16 CHAIR FELLER: Other questions?

17 MR. HEIKKILA: I will say, Barry, just
18 to add onto that, this is Heath again, one of the
19 things that I really appreciate about the
20 quantitative goals is there wasn't a real effort
21 to look at what the current habitat conditions
22 will support in terms of natural production. And

1 so it really starts to give you an idea with some
2 of the tools that we have out here and models of
3 whatnot on habitat to start the news. A little
4 bit of value, figuring out best value in terms of
5 as a region talking about if we do want to achieve
6 these higher numbers, how might we go about doing
7 that in the most, here are the options and here
8 are the costs of doing it that we haven't dealt
9 with that in phase one. But I think those are the
10 kinds of discussions that will happen in phase two
11 and beyond. And I think those will be benefited
12 by the work that's been done here. Looking at the
13 capacity of the current habitat and as a basis for
14 moving forward.

15 MR. THOM: Yeah, as well as the
16 relationships that have been built around the
17 table to be able to have that discussion.

18 MR. FISHER: Good.

19 MS. LUKENS: Barry, this is Jennifer. I
20 just might add that the Bonneville program is
21 largely focused on habitat work and hatchery
22 production. It's entirely possible that as part

1 of phase two, we may entertain some fairly
2 creative ideas about things that might happen in
3 the basin but go beyond just hatchery production
4 and habitat improvement. And so Bonneville may be
5 a logical funding partner, but there may be other
6 ways to do things. So I've heard people speak in
7 that regard and it's encouraging to me that we
8 have some folks who definitely are not afraid to
9 think outside the box on some of this stuff. Just
10 for the opportunity to save progressively about
11 different ways of doing things that might not
12 saddle one particular entity with the financial
13 responsibility of fixing all this stuff. So those
14 were my observations.

15 CHAIR FELLER: Are there other
16 questions? I guess I have kind of -- oh, do you,
17 do you have one?

18 MS. ANDERS: I have one.

19 CHAIR FELLER: You have one?

20 MS. LUKENS: Yeah.

21 CHAIR FELLER: Go for it.

22 MS. LUKENS: Hi, this is the other

1 Jennifer, Jennifer Lukens. I have one of the
2 handouts that was provided to us is just the
3 outline of what the recommendations document would
4 look like and kind of thinking about the gap
5 between the next steps, the first bullet and the
6 second bullet and getting -- I'm asking this
7 question in terms of folks around the table to
8 wrap their minds around what the taskforce is
9 going to be transmitting to you all. And looking
10 at the outline here, I think a lot of the first
11 couple of chapters seem to be summaries or more
12 put in writing what you all have presented to us
13 at the last several meetings. You all the,
14 taskforce folks presented to MAFAC at the past
15 couple of meetings. So I think a lot of that
16 information has been relayed to a lot of the
17 members who have been around for a while.

18 It might be new to some of the newer
19 members, but then as far as the new content and
20 information that MAFAC will be expected to be
21 looking at is really the actual meat of the
22 qualitative and the quantitative goals and I think

1 you all have done a nice job of teeing us up for
2 looking at those. I'm certainly, it's a really
3 looking at the qualitative -- quantitative, sorry,
4 handout that you have in front of us. It really
5 makes it pretty easy to look at. So I just wanted
6 to raise that issue. I'm not sure if it's really
7 a question. Is there anything else that you all
8 would like to add about the format of the report
9 and what MAFAC could expect or anything that would
10 happen between when you get this to aversion
11 that's ready for MAFAC? Did that make sense?

12 MR. THOM: And maybe in two. Katherine?
13 I don't know if you have any updates on the report
14 itself. I'd deepen the weeds of trying to get it
15 completed.

16 MS. CHENEY: Yes, we should be well on
17 track to complete it by the end of January. We
18 have a very active and engaged drafting team that
19 is working hard together and we're just about to
20 send a new version out today and then we have
21 another review, one more round of reviews in early
22 December. So, I think we're feeling pretty

1 confident.

2 MR. THOM: Katherine, do you have a
3 sense for how long the report is without the
4 references and dependencies?

5 MS. LUKENS: It is about 180 pages, but
6 about 80 of that is the actual spreadsheets
7 themselves of the goals. The example, similar to
8 the example that you have of Mid C, we have one of
9 each of those for the 24 stocks, so that's about
10 80 pages along with the methodology summary. And
11 then in the bulk of the rest of the text, about 50
12 pages is the higher level summary of the
13 methodology for the quantitative goals and another
14 50 on the context.

15 MR. THOM: Okay, thanks.

16 MS. LUKENS: So, this is Jennifer. It
17 just sounds like that's a significant amount of
18 information that's going to be coming to MAFAC's
19 way. So we need to do a little thinking of how
20 best to transmit that and get that information so
21 you all can -- so we don't -- I'm not sure you're
22 expected to read all 180 pages and understand

1 fully of that, but really understand the
2 overarching goals and concepts of the
3 recommendations that they're putting forward
4 there. So, I'm at Heidi and I will work with the
5 team to make sure that whatever is -- you'll get
6 the report, but a way of summarizing that to a
7 form and fashion that would be most easy for you
8 all as a committee together to digest and weigh in
9 on.

10 CHAIR FELLER: Yeah. Just to add onto
11 that, I'm kind of curious for you guys are there
12 -- as you're developing this, are there particular
13 -- I guess maybe I should put it this way, if
14 there are things that would be good discussion
15 points with MAFAC as we kind of -- as we consider
16 the report and what we're going to transmit to
17 NOAA, it might be really good to kind of have that
18 be part of the package, I think, to help us sort
19 of focus our minds on what we're reviewing and how
20 we consider that, but we might want to definitely
21 think about some process steps to make sure people
22 are familiar with it and able to participate in

1 that -- participate fully in that discussion. So
2 we're really happy with the next step.

3 MS. LUKENS: So this is Jennifer.
4 Certainly, these are the experts out there who are
5 putting this report together and the intent isn't
6 to take this report and take a whole new drafting
7 to it, but at least making you -- making sure that
8 you are all comfortable with the recommendations
9 being MAFAC ultimate recommendations. There is the
10 intent. So, what I just, the comment I made
11 earlier was if anybody walked away thinking that
12 we would be editing this report in, you know, as
13 an expert, I didn't want you to walk away with
14 that. That wasn't my intention.

15 MR. THOM: This is Barry. I think from
16 my perspective to one component I would be
17 interested in from the MAFAC members of here, now
18 or later of do you have specific questions you may
19 be interested in as you're reviewing the report,
20 that would be useful for us to know ahead of time
21 so we could potentially either make sure those are
22 addressed or point those items or issues out as it

1 comes forward for review.

2 CHAIR FELLER: Sebastian and then Joe.

3 MR. BELL: Sebastian Bell here. A
4 couple of questions. One is, can anybody tell me
5 how much money is being spent expended on an
6 annual basis currently in the Columbia River Basin
7 to restore or enhance the existing runs? Is there
8 -- is that a number that's out there somewhere?

9 MR. THOM: This is Barry. I cannot --
10 so if we leave the number at just what is actually
11 being used to rebuild runs or provide for habitat
12 restoration, I don't think there is a specific
13 number out there. It's in the couple of hundreds
14 of millions of dollars in terms of direct
15 investment in restoration type work in the basin
16 and whether that's from the Bonneville Program on
17 Habitat, the Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund or
18 sometimes coming in from like the Forest Service
19 or EPA and other federal agencies.

20 MR. BELL: So just to follow up, does
21 that -- so that includes actions that are being
22 taken to try to address physical issues with the

1 run as well as the cost of management in agencies?

2 MR. THOM: No, it's probably more when
3 you talk about the management of the agency. So a
4 piece that I haven't listed, which is -- when you
5 look at the Bonneville Fish and Wildlife Program,
6 which is around \$300 million a year, I would just
7 recognize that the Bonneville program focuses on
8 both listed (inaudible) and other listed species
9 as well as non listed species, both fish and
10 wildlife. And a significant component of that is
11 more of a mitigation component related to hatchery
12 management in the Columbia Basin as well. So
13 that's where I -- they also provide some
14 accounting of the cost of foregone power
15 generation by water that is built through the
16 river, which I have not included in some of that
17 accounting. And when you look at that NOAA
18 fisheries budget on the West Coast related to our
19 ESA salmon management responsibilities, including
20 the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund, both
21 internal agency resources and that grant program
22 are about \$120 million dollars a year, including

1 both science and management.

2 MR. BELL: Okay, great. And then just
3 one last follow-up, is this report going to go
4 through some sort of a peer reviewed process
5 before it comes to us or --

6 MR. THOM: I didn't know somebody was
7 addressing that?

8 MS. LOVETT: Yeah, this is Heidi. I was
9 just going to say, so that was what Barry
10 described to you a little bit is that the members
11 of the committee themselves did share a lot of
12 information with their -- the groups that they
13 represent or that they're active in over the
14 course of the summer. And that was what Barry was
15 referring to early on. So they have been sharing
16 that information and the technical teams that have
17 been gathering the data and putting them together
18 are experts who have the science and information
19 from the states, from the member groups, from
20 other agencies as well as from NOAA Fisheries. So
21 it was a lot of technical expertise went into
22 particularly the development of the quantitative

1 data and information that are on the sheets that
2 you have. And that was described I'm a little bit
3 more also at the June meeting, how that work came
4 about. Does that -- I'm sorry Barry, if I stepped
5 on your toes for answering that one.

6 MR. THOM: No, no, that is fine. Yeah,
7 there was not an intention to do sort of a -- I
8 mean maybe if we could think of as a standard
9 scientific peer review of the actual
10 recommendations report before it goes to MAFAC.

11 MR. BELL: Okay. So that's why I asked
12 the question. I mean I just -- as a guy who's not
13 in the West Coast salmon world, I would feel
14 rather presumptuous being passing judgment on
15 something that I know very little about. So
16 that's why I'm asking if there's some other entity
17 out there that's going to look at an external
18 group to look at the recommendations. If MAFAC is
19 the only group that's going to look at the
20 recommendations, then that would perhaps raise a
21 flag for me.

22 MR. THOM: There will be as a separate

1 -- so one of the things about this process as
2 these recommendations go forward as a product of
3 the taskforce to MAFAC knowing that, or the
4 entities around the table and I'll point to the
5 Northwest Power and Conservation Council, there is
6 a possibility that individual states or members
7 could recommend that the Northwest Power and
8 Conservation Council adopt these quantitative
9 goals as part of their plan review process that
10 they implant as a five-year plan, and Jennifer
11 maybe have more information, and there is a
12 potential that, that could be brought forward to
13 roll into the Power Council process and would
14 also, that would be an additional level of review
15 before those goals will be adopted by the Council.

16 CHAIR FELLER: Joe, I think you're the
17 last question. Unless Randy, did you have
18 something? You want to go next?

19 MR. FISHER: Yeah, I've kind of followed
20 along. Barry, at one time, there was a lot of
21 discussion about whether there will be a minority
22 report or if that was possible. I guess the

1 question is, is you know everybody has their own
2 idea of what a goal is. So is there -- has there
3 been fairly good agreement by Up River Tribes and
4 everything or could MAFAC end up with a list of
5 things that says, "Here's what we think." It's
6 different.

7 MR. THOM: Yeah, that's a good question,
8 Randy. So, we are through the November meeting,
9 we are trying to achieve consensus around the
10 table for the goals as they come forward in the
11 recommendations report. When we pooled the group
12 in October, all but one of the parties was willing
13 to say at that point, given the progress you've
14 made and then with a few caveats of filling in the
15 details on some of the quantitative pieces by
16 November that they would be able to reach that
17 consensus. A piece of uncertainty has been that
18 Columbia, the lower Columbia River tribes that are
19 members of the Columbia River Intertribal Fish
20 Commission, that has taken a longer amount of
21 time. They have a representative from what we
22 call CITFC, have the table, but not the members

1 from the individual four tribes. And so that's
2 taken an extra step to achieve that buy in from
3 the individual tribes so that they can sort of
4 pass their vote, you would say, to that
5 representative from CITFC and I have been working
6 Zach Penny who's on the taskforce to actually meet
7 with the tribal councils of those four tribes to
8 achieve their buy in and we're hopeful that they
9 will be providing letters of recommendation to Mr.
10 Penny either prior to or around that November
11 timeframe with their support. So, we're still on
12 track to achieve the support from those tribes
13 prior to submission of the report to MAFAC, and so
14 that would be the sort of what we call our full
15 consensus of the group and wouldn't negate the
16 need for any sort of minority report moving
17 forward.

18 CHAIR FELLER: Okay. Joe, last
19 question.

20 MR. SCHUMACHER: Thank you. Good
21 question, Randy. Thanks. Hey, just a point of
22 clarification folks, I'm looking at your fisheries

1 harvest table on the handout here. And I'm
2 curious why you don't show any ocean intercept
3 information on there.

4 MR. THOM: Is that the steelhead
5 example?

6 MR. SCHUMACHER: So it doesn't -- it's
7 not clear.

8 MS. LOVETT: Yes.

9 MR. SCHUMACHER: Is that what we're
10 looking at there?

11 MS. LOVETT: Yeah, it's the same as Mid
12 Steelhead deal.

13 MR. SCHUMACHER: Oh, okay. Never mind,
14 all right. Thank you very much. That's what --
15 that's clarification. Thank you.

16 CHAIR FELLER: Anything else? Barry?
17 Heath? Jennifer, any last -- Katherine, any last
18 comments?

19 MS. CHENEY: No, thank you for your
20 time.

21 MR. THOM: No, thanks for the support.

22 CHAIR FELLER: Wonderful. Thank you so

1 much for the presentation. I think we're done.
2 We're a bit head of scheduled, 12 minutes.

3 MR. LOVETT: Awesome.

4 CHAIR FELLER: Holy Cow. I was a little
5 worried this morning.

6 MS. LOVETT: Thank you operator. That
7 part of our meeting is over and thanks everyone
8 for being on the line.

9 OPERATOR: Thank you. Will you be
10 returning at all this afternoon?

11 MS. LOVETT: We're having a subcommittee
12 breakouts and so there's no guest speakers during
13 that time, but for one of our subcommittees we can
14 keep this line open if there's any general public
15 members that are interested.

16 OPERATOR: All right. Currently you
17 have none of -- no one from the public on. So do
18 you want me to keep the conference going?

19 MR. LOVETT: No, I think you can close
20 it then. Thank you.

21 OPERATOR: Close it down. All right,
22 thank you very much. Have a good afternoon.

1 MS. LOVETT: Thanks.

2 OPERATOR: Bye.

3 MS. LUKENS: So, I think that concludes
4 the work of the whole committee today. We are
5 going to break out and we have two subcommittee
6 meetings scheduled and like I said earlier, if you
7 aren't on a particular one of the two committees
8 that are scheduled, the Recreational Fisheries
9 Subcommittee, sorry or the Strategic Planning
10 Subcommittee, please, you are welcome to join
11 whichever one you feel you would be most
12 interested in. The Strategic Planning
13 Subcommittee is going to stay here and the
14 Recreational Fishery Subcommittee is going to move
15 to a different floor, room 5414 and Heidi will be
16 going up that way in a few moments. So, do we
17 want to convene it 2:45, like as planned?

18 MS. LOVETT: Yeah, I think so.

19 MS. LUKENS: So, we will make sure that
20 you are in your appropriate room at 2:45 for those
21 subcommittee meetings. Those committees will
22 adjourn at 4:15 and then we will move over to

1 Building 3. And Heidi, did you have a plan for
2 mass migration or how we're going to do that?

3 MS. LOVETT: Yeah, so the Gateway
4 Exhibit is in the bottom ground level of Building
5 2, which is in that direction, the main street
6 when you walk out the front door, it's to the
7 right. You walk to the next building and you walk
8 around the corner and you'll see it like a ticker
9 tape sign if you came -- I don't know if anybody
10 came that way or came via metro. There's a door
11 that says NOAA Gateway Exhibit and the -- it
12 should be open if you happen to finish early and
13 want to get there early. We have a colleague of
14 ours who was going to come -- David Hall was going
15 to come and be there to give a short presentation
16 and explain how the exhibit got started. The
17 kinds of information that's there and possibly a
18 little bit about a traveling gateway exhibit
19 that's been traveling around the country for the
20 last few years since our 200th Anniversary. The
21 agency's 200th Anniversary. Because it's literally
22 adjacent to the entrance to the metro, we thought

1 from there we would just metro down to Union
2 Station. Happily, there's not a lot of outside.
3 You don't -- you hopefully won't get rained on,
4 but once you're in the metro and you're going to
5 Union Station, you don't have to step outside
6 again until you come back because Legal Seafoods
7 is right in Union Station. Maybe Roger can tell
8 us more about where it is exactly there. I assume
9 there's signage. And [Laughter] I know he's been
10 there anyway.

11 MR. BERKOWITZ: Yeah, follow the smell
12 of the fish.

13 MS. ANDERS: So, that was our plan and
14 that's obviously that's a sort of, what's the word
15 we call, kind of a no host a gathering just so you
16 guys can meet each other, socialize and enjoy a
17 little bit of seafood. And then our meeting does
18 begin a little later. It begins at 9:00 o'clock
19 tomorrow. And I have I think I had shared with
20 you that for the hotel, for their shuttle service,
21 we told them 7:45 and 8:00 and I think I said 8:15
22 and 8:30 for tomorrow. And the next day was when

1 shuttles will be coming this way and hopefully, if
2 the rain clears up, some of you may even want to
3 enjoy a nice walk. But if there are people that
4 do desire to go back to the hotel, I was going to
5 email them and let them know what a good time to
6 pick up would be, so that they could meet you in
7 it in advance. So -- I mean I'd like to inform
8 them in advance, but -- so that's good if anybody
9 would like to share that with me now. But
10 otherwise, once you come back -- if there is a set
11 time that a bunch of you think you'll be coming
12 back, I can also inform the hotel of that and they
13 will get a shuttle to meet you at the metro as a
14 group. But individually they're not -- their
15 shuttle is not as sufficient as it used to be, I'm
16 afraid. So, you might be Lyfting or Ubering or
17 taxiing over to the hotel if you don't feel like
18 walking or if I'm on the same train with you, I
19 will drive you there. And I did want to say I did
20 have some hot water and tea. If anybody's
21 interested here and tomorrow, we'll have a little
22 bit of coffee here.

1 MS. LUKENS: Just remind them.

2 MS. ANDERS: Okay, just reminder, Rec
3 Fish's, room in room -- I got to use my glasses,
4 Rec Fish's is in the eighth floor room 8514 and
5 that will convene at 2:45. Strategic planning
6 will be in here at 2:45.

7 CHAIR FELLER: And if we don't see you
8 at either of those, we'll see you at the bar.

9 MS. LUKENS: Or if you've been at the
10 bar then we'll really see you.

11 (Whereupon, at 2:24 p.m., the
12 PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.)

13 * * * * *

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

2 COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

3 I, Carleton J. Anderson, III, notary
4 public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia, do
5 hereby certify that the forgoing PROCEEDING was
6 duly recorded and thereafter reduced to print under
7 my direction; that the witnesses were sworn to tell
8 the truth under penalty of perjury; that said
9 transcript is a true record of the testimony given
10 by witnesses; that I am neither counsel for,
11 related to, nor employed by any of the parties to
12 the action in which this proceeding was called;
13 and, furthermore, that I am not a relative or
14 employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the
15 parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise
16 interested in the outcome of this action.

17

18 (Signature and Seal on File)

19 Notary Public, in and for the Commonwealth of
20 Virginia

21 My Commission Expires: November 30, 2020

22 Notary Public Number 351998